

MARYLAND.

Harry E. Pyle, Aberdeen Proving Ground.
Charles F. Peters, Western Port.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Fred C. Small, Buzzards Bay.

MINNESOTA.

Ida E. Marshall, Babbitt.
Frederic E. Hamlin, Chaska.
Charles G. Carlson, Gibbon.
Francis S. Pollard, Morgan.
Selma O. Hoff, St. Hilaire.
Alfred Gronner, Underwood.

NEW YORK.

Medose J. Robert, Au Sable Forks.
Elmer C. Wyman, Dover Plains.
Rose H. Munsey, Dryden.

OHIO.

Arthur L. Van Osdall, Ashland.
Edward M. Barber, Ashley.
Charles E. Kniesly, Bradford.
Elizabeth A. Krizer, Bremen.
Andrew L. Brunson, Degraff.
Elizabeth I. Grimm, Hopedale.
Bayard F. Thompson, Jewett.
William H. Snodgrass, Marysville.
Clem Couden, Morrow.
La Bert Davie, New Lexington.
Orlando W. Schwab, Port Washington.
Rufus A. Borland, West Jefferson.

OKLAHOMA.

John P. Jones, Roff.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William A. Leroy, Canonsburg.
Thomas Collins, Commodore.
Joseph N. Ritchey, Falls Creek.
Tillie Bradley, Loretto.
Winston J. Beglin, Midland.
Thomas J. Kennedy, Renfrew.
Edna Bracken, Wehrum.

TENNESSEE.

Thomas W. Williams, Lucy.

TEXAS.

Gustav A. Wulfman, Farwell.
Theodor Reichert, Nordheim.
Hal Singleton, O'Donnell.
Silas J. White, Rising Star.
William J. Davis, Silsbee.
Fannie Dawson, Wilson.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Guy E. McCutcheon, Reedy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *March 1, 1924.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of life, Thy benediction enlightens, cheers, and blesses. Thy earthly children, we therefore own Thee as our Father and our God. Cause us to keep Thy precepts and walk in the ways of Thy wisdom. We thank Thee that we share Thy rational and spiritual nature and may draw our usefulness and happiness from the great infinite source of all truth. Let us hear the inward voice that speaks in terms of peace, righteousness, and purity, and keep us this day without sin. May the dawn of the morrow come to us with the breath of God, blessing us and making us to rejoice and be glad about our happy hearthstones. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry. I notice in the reading of the Journal it was stated that the gentleman from Oregon offered the following amendment to the Garner amendment. Of course, we all know what that means, but

does the Journal show amendments by the name of the individual introducing them?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks the amendments are reported by their number.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, so far as the Record is concerned, that is all right, but in the Journal, which is, after all, the official record of the body in any legal controversies or constructions that may arise, it occurs to me that to use the name of the individual might possibly be meaningless.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the Journal clerk should make the correction according to the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As I recall it, the amendments are set out in the Journal, I believe, under some sort of number. I am quite sure that is correct. I simply call attention to that matter.

The SPEAKER. With the correction indicated, the Journal will stand approved.

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MADDEN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 7449) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying report, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee reserved all points of order.

EXPUNGING REMARKS FROM THE RECORD.

Mr. MICHAELSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that remarks which I made under the privilege of extension contained matter in violation of the rules of the House. It has never been my intent, and is not now, willfully to violate any rule of the House, much less so in an extension of any remarks I may have the privilege of making. If that is so, and it seems to be so, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw, revise, and reextend my remarks upon this very important subject of water diversion from Lake Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to withdraw, revise, and reextend remarks he made in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to my colleague that the first part of his remarks contains a valuable contribution to the subject and contains much valuable information, and that he withdraw that portion of his remarks to which objection has been made. The rest of it is all right and is a valuable contribution to the subject.

Mr. MICHAELSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his suggestion, but I would rather proceed the other way and withdraw the entire matter and revise and reextend if I may have that privilege.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from Ohio withdraw his motion, which is in the Record, to strike out these remarks? This would not be in order otherwise.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think the motion is pending now. I am certainly entirely satisfied with the statement of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MICHAELSON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an agreement entered into by the trustees of the sanitary district of Chicago and Members of Congress representing Chicago districts, I, as the Illinois Member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, introduced in the House on November 9, 1921, a bill (H. R. 9046) providing for the amount of water which may be withdrawn from Lake Michigan by the Sanitary District of Chicago, giving authority therefor, and fixing the conditions of such withdrawal.

This bill, because of objections raised by the War Department, failed of passage. Believing that a study by the War Department of facts and figures subsequently presented relative to the Chicago drainage question will now bring about a favorable report, I reintroduced the bill (H. R. 6873) on February 11, 1924.

This bill, when passed, will authorize by law the withdrawal of 10,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan, an amount which is necessary to properly dilute and take care of the sewage of Chicago's 3,000,000 population, thereby pre-

venting pollution of our Lake Michigan drinking water and stamping out forever the dreaded typhoid fever. It will also make possible the construction of a 9-foot Illinois waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf.

The question of insuring pure drinking water to the people of Chicago, thereby protecting health, and the necessity of securing congressional action in the matter have been discussed for years, but no action has been obtained; and it is my purpose here to show what sinister interests and influences, in order to serve their own selfish desires for gain, power, or favor, have for years been gambling with the lives of 3,000,000 people and by publicity and the use of official power have been obstructing, delaying, and preventing congressional action having for its purpose a solution of this most serious problem.

Pure drinking water is essential to healthy human life. Ninety years ago the village of Chicago drank from wells; so did the city, until the wells became so filled with poison, which leaked through the sand from vaults and cesspools into the wells, that there was "death in the cup."

Then the water supply was dipped from the lake where its waves lapped the shore and water peddlers distributed it to the people for pay.

Then water was pumped from the lake a short distance from shore into tanks, from which it was conveyed through wooden pipes to the consumers. But it was not long before the shore waters became unfit for use, and the pipes through which the water was drawn had to be extended farther into the lake. Sewage was disposed of by discharging it into the Chicago River or directly into Lake Michigan.

As population increased so did the amount of filth which was discharged into the lake. The death rate from typhoid fever was higher than that of any other city in the country. The highest death rate was among the children and the poor people, who could not move away or afford water from any other source than the polluted waters of Lake Michigan.

Under these circumstances and for the purpose of protecting the public health the Sanitary District of Chicago was created as a public body under a State law passed by the Illinois General Assembly in 1889.

It was authorized to build a sanitary and ship canal connecting the Chicago River with the Des Plaines River and empowered to divert the sewage, which at that time polluted Lake Michigan, into the Mississippi watershed.

The State law required the sanitary district to dilute the sewage turned into the Des Plaines River on a basis of $3\frac{1}{2}$ cubic feet of water per second for each 1,000 population. The main drainage canal, which is 32 miles long, 24 feet deep, and 160 feet wide, has a capacity of about 10,000 cubic feet per second, and was intended to care for a population of 3,000,000.

The Sanitary District of Chicago lies along the shore of Lake Michigan. About 10 miles west of the shore line, at a height of only 11 feet above Lake Michigan, is the summit between the Gulf of Mexico, 1,600 miles to the south, and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, 1,700 miles to the east. The city of Joliet, 40 miles from Lake Michigan, is 40 feet lower than Chicago. Nowhere else on the whole chain of lakes has nature provided for such a gravity flow from one watershed into another.

The main channel of the sanitary district, costing about \$30,000,000, was built prior to 1899, but the water was not turned in until 1900, as the intercepting sewers connecting the city's sewers with the Chicago River and the drainage canal had not then been completed. Since that time the Chicago and Des Plaines Rivers have been improved by the district, and other branch canals, pumping stations, intercepting sewers, and sewage-treatment plants, representing a total cost of about \$90,000,000, have been constructed.

The Chicago plan of sewage disposal by dilution and diversion from Lake Michigan, aided by the pasteurization of milk and the chlorination of water, resulted in a reduction of the typhoid death rate to the lowest point of any big city in the world. During the past year, however, with the sanitary district controlled by the Chicago Tribune, through its bipartisan combination, and the city of Chicago under Democratic rule, several hundred cases of typhoid fever, with numerous deaths, have occurred.

After the main channel had been completed, but before the water was turned in, Congress passed a law under which the War Department claims the right to limit the amount of water which may be taken from Lake Michigan for sewage dilution on the ground that the withdrawal by the district of the amount of water required under the Illinois law has reduced the levels of all the Great Lakes, except Lake Superior, by about $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and is an obstruction to navigation and commerce.

Federal engineers and officials had full knowledge of the creation of the sanitary district and of the plan to reverse the flow of the Chicago River and to divert from Lake Michigan the amount of water needed to properly dilute the sewage of the district so that when discharged into the Des Plaines River it would not be offensive or injurious to the health of any of the people of Illinois.

As far as I am able to learn, no objection to this plan was made by Federal authorities at that time, and, prior to the opening of the canal in 1900, a permit for the diversion of 4,167 cubic feet of water per second—sufficient to care for a population of 1,250,000—was issued by the then Secretary of War. Since then, however, that office has consistently refused to grant permission for any greater flow, regardless of increased population, on the ground that Congress alone has authority to permit such diversion.

In the meantime the growth of population was so rapid that it became necessary, in order to protect the public health, to increase the amount of water used for dilution purposes as required by the Illinois law, but in excess of the amount authorized by the War Department permit.

The district contains about 450 square miles, including all of Chicago and about 50 other incorporated cities and villages in Cook County. It is governed by a board of nine trustees, three being elected every two years. The trustees have authority to levy annual taxes up to two-thirds of 1 per cent of the assessed valuation of all property within the district and may also issue bonds not to exceed 3 per cent of such assessed valuation.

The main diversion channel of the district was intended to care for an ultimate population of 3,000,000. We had reached that limit in 1920, to say nothing of the trade wastes which are equal to a population of at least a million and a half more—so some method of sewage disposal other than by dilution and diversion must be provided to care for the constantly growing excess in population.

To appease the rising wrath of the War Department, due to the alleged, but wholly theoretical, lowering of lake levels caused by the sanitary district's diversion at Chicago—stimulated no doubt by the demand of the water-power interests that all the waters of the Great Lakes this side of Niagara should pass over the Falls or through the turbines there, which produce immense profits for private owners of power privileges on both sides of the boundary—the trustees had on July 8, 1920, adopted an ordinance—

Offering and agreeing to defray the expense of the construction of works in one or more of the outlets of the Great Lakes to compensate for any diminishing levels of the Great Lakes due to the diversion of 10,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan by the Sanitary District of Chicago, etc.

In accordance with this program there was secured from the 1921 session of the Illinois Legislature two important amendments of the sanitary district act, one of which, in express terms, not only authorizes but requires the building by the district of sewage purification works, supplemental to the dilution system, to care for our constantly growing population, so that no further increase in the amount of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan would be necessary.

Another amendment authorizes the district to deal directly with the Federal Government and to pay for the construction of regulating or compensating works in the outlets of the Great Lakes to restore lake levels and justify Congress in passing a law permitting the continued use of our present sewage dilution system and the diversion of the amount of water now being used for that purpose.

At the same session the legislature, by joint resolution No. 41, unanimously passed, declared the policy of the State of Illinois in favor of the continued diversion of water from Lake Michigan for purposes of sanitation and to adequately supply the Illinois waterway. The resolution further provided for a commission of 10 persons, 4 appointed by the speaker of the house, 3 by the president of the senate, and 3 by the governor, to cooperate with the trustees of the sanitary district and the Illinois delegation in Congress to secure authority for the withdrawal of 10,000 cubic feet of water from Lake Michigan for said purposes. An appropriation of \$15,000 for the expenses of this commission was also passed.

These laws were approved by Governor Small and became effective July 1, 1921.

In the meantime the attorney general of Wisconsin had, after several fruitless efforts, induced the legislature of that State to authorize him to file suit in the Supreme Court to restrain the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago from

diverting any water from Lake Michigan on the ground that such withdrawal lowers the lake levels, injures the ports and harbors of Wisconsin on Lake Michigan, and obstructs commerce and navigation.

The Wisconsin attorney general agreed to withhold suit until the trustees of the sanitary district had been given a fair chance to lay their plans before Congress. The suit of Wisconsin *v.* Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago was not filed until the October, 1922, term of the Supreme Court, long after it became apparent that because of some influence at work in Washington the proposed plan for early congressional action was being thwarted.

In furtherance of the plan to secure early and harmonious action a suggested form of a bill was prepared, and on September 20, 1921, the following invitation was sent to all Members of Congress from Illinois:

The trustees of the Sanitary District of Chicago expect to suggest to the Congress of the United States certain legislation which is necessary to protect the public health of the residents of the sanitary district and of the residents of the Illinois Valley, and would appreciate an opportunity to discuss the matter with you and the other members of the Illinois congressional delegation.

Finding that several Illinois Members of Congress are now in Chicago, the trustees earnestly invite you to be their guest at an informal luncheon to be held at room 103, Hotel La Salle, Chicago, on Friday, September 23, 1921, at 12.30 o'clock. We hope you can arrange to be present.

Several members of the Illinois delegation attended the conference, which was held in Chicago on September 23, and others who were unable to attend expressed their willingness to cooperate in the plan outlined.

At this conference, upon suggestion of Congressman MARTIN B. MADDEN, it was unanimously agreed that the proposed bill should be introduced by me, as I was the Illinois Member of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and I introduced the bill November 9, 1921 (H. R. 9046, 67th Cong., 1st sess.).

On the day of the conference, September 23, 1921, however, there was introduced in the Senate a joint resolution:

Requesting the President to invite the Government of Great Britain to join in the formation of an international commission, to be composed of three members representing the United States and three members representing the Dominion of Canada, to investigate the flow of water through the Chicago drainage canal and to make such recommendations as they may deem advisable to their respective Governments, looking to an agreement or treaty which will secure an adequate flow of water through such canal.

This resolution (S. J. Res. 116, 67th Cong., 1st sess.) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and if adopted by the Senate and concurred in by the House would have put the Government of the United States in the false position of admitting that Great Britain has some control over the inland waters of the United States, and consenting to representatives of the English Government having equal voice with our own in determining the use to which the waters of Lake Michigan, wholly within the United States, may be put. No action was taken on it.

As a matter of fact, under article 2 of the existing "treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States of America relating to boundary waters and questions arising along the boundary between Canada and the United States" (proclaimed May 13, 1910), each country "reserves to itself" the exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion of all waters on its own side of the boundary line "which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary or into boundary waters." This absolutely excludes Lake Michigan.

This treaty of 1910 created an international joint commission of six members, three representing the United States and three the Dominion of Canada, but it has no authority over diversions "existing" at the time, to which class the sanitary district diversion belongs.

My bill (H. R. 9046) was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, which committee sent it to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, who forwarded the same to the United States district engineer at Chicago—Col. William V. Judson—who returned the same to his superior officer with a favorable recommendation. (See Doc. No. 2, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, 67th Cong., 1st sess.)

Meanwhile, for the first time in many years, representatives of the sanitary district and the State government, through its executive and administrative officers and through the waterways commission, created under H. J. R. No. 41 of the Fifty-second General Assembly, were actively cooperating with the Illinois delegation in Congress, supported by the associations

of commerce and other civic bodies in the State, to promote the passage of H. R. 9046, which, if successful, would not only have disposed of the injunction proceedings brought by the United States against the sanitary district, but would have saved the Wisconsin suit from being filed.

Engineering briefs in support of the Michaelson bill (H. R. 9046, 67th Cong.) were prepared by the Illinois Department of Public Works, division of waterways, and by the sanitary district for consideration by the Chief of Engineers of the United States. He, however, asked for more detailed information as to the financial capacity of the district and its ability to construct additional sewage treatment works in a shorter period than provided for in the bill.

The management of the sanitary district, the legislative and executive departments of the State government, the Illinois and Chicago Associations of Commerce, and many other State-wide commercial organizations had approved H. R. 9046, and all were working together in complete harmony; the engineers had prepared the information requested by the Chief of Engineers and were ready to submit the same, when, on January 6, 1922, like a bolt from the blue there came a message from Washington announcing to the trustees of the sanitary district that the Secretary of War had transmitted to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors a report prepared by the Chief of Engineers, which report on the Michaelson bill was very prejudicial to its passage.

When I protested to the Chief of Engineers against this apparent breach of faith in not giving the State and sanitary district engineers a chance to supply the information prepared at his suggestion before making his report, that official stated in substance that his action had been taken by direction of the Secretary of War and at the instigation, as he understood, of a member of another body.

Subsequently, January 23, 1923, a bill was introduced in the Senate carrying provisions similar to the original Michaelson measure. The bill was referred for consideration to a "select committee" composed of five Senators, with Senator McCormick as chairman, appointed under a resolution introduced by him January 16, 1923. This select committee has not yet reported.

In the meantime, on June 18, 1923, Joseph B. Fleming, of R. R. McCormick's law firm, acting as Special Attorney General of the United States, secured an injunction restraining the sanitary district from diverting from Lake Michigan more than 4,167 cubic feet of water per second, although over 8,500 cubic feet per second is now being used, and under the Illinois State law at least 10,000 cubic feet per second is required.

If this injunction should be sustained by the United States Supreme Court, in which it is now pending, it will reduce the present flow in the Drainage Canal by more than one-half. This will not only double the pollution of the Desplaines and Illinois Rivers but, since the run-off of water in the sanitary district is 10,000 cubic feet per second, the curtailment of the flow in the Drainage Canal will in times of heavy rainfall result in the reversing of the current of the Chicago River and send its sewage-polluted water into the lake to mingle with our drinking water—as it did recently, through the fault of some one, with dire consequences on the south side—thus carrying germs of typhoid fever into the homes of all residents of the sanitary district.

If Robert R. McCormick was sincere in his pretended hope and desire that the sanitary district would defeat the suit of the Federal Government to reduce to 4,167 cubic feet per second the amount of water to be withdrawn through the drainage canal and discharged into the Illinois waterway, how does it happen that Joseph B. Fleming (of the law firm of McCormick, Kirkland, Patterson & Fleming, of which this same Robert R. McCormick, "coeditor" of the Chicago Tribune, and sometime president of the sanitary district, is the titular head) was in 1922 appointed Special Attorney General of the United States to prosecute this old injunction suit which was started with the tacit approval if not at the instigation of Robert R. McCormick when he was president of the district?

Congressional authority to continue the present diversion of water, which would have saved the injunction from being issued, was provided for in the Michaelson bill, introduced November 9, 1921.

Responsibility for delay in securing congressional action and relief for the more than 3,000,000 people whose health is put in peril by the pending injunction does not rest upon my shoulders, although this false charge was printed in the Chicago Tribune.

Responsibility for the present wasteful and incompetent management of sanitary district affairs rests upon the Chicago Tribune and its family, who through a bipartisan deal and their control of publicity and patronage—not to mention any

possible influence they may have with certain agencies of protection or prosecution—are able to dictate to the trustees of the district, a majority of whom make haste to carry out the Tribune's orders.

As evidence bearing out the facts here stated and called to your attention, I herewith submit excerpts from a letter recently received from William F. Mulvihill, a citizen of Chicago, who as former chief counsel for the drainage board made an investigation and a thorough study of this entire subject:

FEBRUARY 25, 1924.

In re the Sanitary District of Chicago.

Hon. M. A. MICHAELSON,

Representative in Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MICHAELSON: Permit me to call to your attention the inclosed clippings from the Chicago Tribune which falsely charges you with responsibility for the failure of the Sanitary District of Chicago to secure congressional authority to withdraw 10,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan for the purpose of diverting the sewage of said district from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi watershed.

Having been chief counsel for the sanitary district of Chicago for more than two years and also special counsel in the so-called lake level controversy for one year thereafter, I am in a position to know that these charges are absolutely false and that, as a matter of fact, you, on November 9, 1921, introduced in Congress a bill expressly authorizing such diversion.

Fearing that these untrue publications might escape your notice, I take the liberty of calling your attention to the same and to the following facts, which place the responsibility for playing politics with the public health of 3,000,000 people where it belongs.

I charge, first, that the Chicago Tribune, although pretending to be a Republican newspaper, pursues a rule-or-ruin policy in politics, and that after its candidates for trustees of the sanitary district were defeated in the Republican primary of 1922 the Tribune bolted the party ticket and supported the Democratic nominees.

I charge, second, that after the Tribune had fooled enough Republicans into voting for the Democrats to defeat the Republican nominees the Tribune forced a bipartisan combination between these Democrats and certain hold-over Republicans, whereby, since that time, the Tribune has controlled a majority of the board of trustees of the sanitary district, and, through that control, the district's annual appropriation bill has been doubled in two years, being boosted from \$19,000,000 in 1922 to \$38,000,000 for 1924.

I charge, third, that this increase in the sanitary district's budget, under the Tribune's bipartisan board, has provided a reservoir of political jobs, which are being used to build up a bipartisan organization to promote the political ambitions of members of the family which owns and publishes the Chicago Tribune.

I charge, fourth, that Robert R. McCormick, former president of the sanitary district, now editor of the Chicago Tribune and a member of the law firm of McCormick, Kirkland, Patterson & Fleming, is more responsible than any other one man for the Federal injunction against the district, now pending in the United States Supreme Court, which if sustained will reduce by more than one-half the amount of water now being withdrawn from Lake Michigan and which is essential for diluting the sewage of Chicago before diverting the same through the Chicago drainage canal into the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers.

I charge, fifth, that this injunction, procured by Joseph R. Fleming, McCormick's law partner, as "Special Attorney General of the United States," on June 18, 1923, if sustained, will, in times of heavy rainfall, reverse the current of the Chicago River and again send its sewage polluted water into the lake to mingle with our drinking water as it did before the drainage canal was dug, when the annual death rate from typhoid fever ran as high as 170 per 100,000 of population.

You will recall, Congressman, that in 1921 the Illinois Legislature amended the sanitary district act authorizing the district to build sewage-purification works, supplemental to its dilution system, so that no increase in the amount of water withdrawn from Lake Michigan will be necessary, and authorizing the district to pay for the construction of compensating works in the outlets of the Great Lakes, to restore lake levels, and justify Congress in permitting the continued use of our present sewage-disposal system, which has cost the taxpayers \$100,000,000.

After Governor Small had approved these amendments and the aid of the Illinois State government had been enlisted, a meeting of the Illinois congressional delegation was held in Chicago on September 20, 1921, to agree upon a plan for securing early congressional authority to continue the present amount of diversion, which would have put an end to the litigation and have made the creation of the present bad situation impossible.

I feel, Congressman, that because the public health of the people of the sanitary district has been put in peril and because the false attacks made upon you in the Chicago Tribune and its allies are attributed to your opponent—who is affiliated with the Tribune political faction

and who is drawing a fat salary from the sanitary district for very little work—it is my duty to call your attention to the facts. I trust that you may be able in some way to inform your constituents and the residents of the sanitary district of the real situation and place the responsibility for the delay in securing congressional action and for the present wasteful and incompetent management of the sanitary district where it belongs.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM F. MULVIHILL.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 3265. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge between the Boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens, in the city and State of New York;

H. R. 3681. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Waccamaw River, in South Carolina;

H. R. 4808. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Pearl River between St. Tammany Parish in Louisiana and Hancock County in Mississippi;

H. R. 4807. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across West Pearl River in the State of Louisiana; and

H. R. 584. An act to authorize the county of Multnomah, Oreg., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Willamette River, in the city of Portland, Oreg., in the vicinity of present site of Sellwood Ferry.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 383. An act for the relief of William R. Bradley, former acting collector of internal revenue for South Carolina; to the Committee on Claims.

WILLIAM H. FULHAM AND BELLE DUPRÉ.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the following reports from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 200.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to William H. Fulham the sum of \$203.33 and to Belle Dupré the sum of \$103.33, being the amount received by them per month as clerks of the late Hon. H. Garland Dupré.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 195.

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills be authorized to appoint an assistant clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills, who shall receive compensation at the rate of \$3 per diem during the sessions of the Sixty-eighth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, payment to commence from the date such clerk entered upon the performance of duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the certificate of the chairman of said committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is this the usual provision made at each session of Congress for assistant clerks?

Mr. MacGREGOR. This has been done ordinarily, only the per diem has been \$6 instead of \$3. We have cut it \$3.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Let me ask this question: Does this increase the number of clerks for the committee over what it was in previous sessions or is it the same number? In other words, how does the present force compare with other sessions?

Mr. MacGREGOR. The Committee on Enrolled Bills has one clerk. This gives him an assistant clerk and has been customary.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understood the gentleman to say that, but how many clerks did they have during the last Congress?

Mr. MacGREGOR. They had the same. We gave the clerk an assistant clerk.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Throughout the major portion of the Congress?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Yes; during practically all of it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask a question?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This is a competent man and you have been paying \$6. Why is it you cut him to \$3 unless you expect to work him half the time? That is a rather unusual thing.

Mr. MacGREGOR. During a good many Congresses they have been paid a per diem, sometimes three and sometimes four, at so much per diem. The chairman of the committee now seems to think he can get along with this one man as a comparing clerk with the regular clerk at this rate.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I am a member of this committee. Would the gentleman mind giving me five minutes on this resolution?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Certainly not. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to call attention to the peculiar actions of inconsistency on the part of the House of Representatives concerning various measures. We are now voting to pay a clerk \$3 a day as compensation. This is supposed to furnish him a livelihood. Yesterday and day before we had a proposition up here concerning the several hundred traveling employees of the Revenue Bureau, and in addition to the big salaries they are to draw and in addition to paying all their transportation expenses, the House of Representatives, over my protest, allowed them \$7 a day additional for subsistence alone.

Mr. GILBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. GILBERT. Does the gentleman know what service this clerk performs?

Mr. BLANTON. The service of an extra clerk to the committee. I presume if he does not perform some service valuable to the country he ought not to be appointed, but if he is appointed he ought to be paid more than \$3 a day for the House to be consistent, especially when the House went on record yesterday in favor of \$7 per day allowance to employees for subsistence. I asked that the rate of subsistence allowance be reduced from \$7 to \$5 and the House voted down that amendment and insisted on paying an allowance for subsistence of \$7 a day in addition to transportation and salaries to certain other employees of the Government. And yet on this occasion we are giving a clerk for the performance of duties \$3 a day. If the duties are not worth performing, he ought not to be appointed.

Mr. GILBERT. For the gentleman's enlightenment I will say that this clerk is a temporary clerk to read and compare the bills. The chairman said he could find a young lady thoroughly competent who would listen while some one else read to see if the comparison was correct, and he could get the service for \$3 a day; and if so, why pay more?

Mr. BLANTON. I agree with the gentleman that for such work you can get an efficient young lady for that remuneration. At the same time, what I was calling the attention of the House to was that if a young lady can live on \$3 a day—furnish board, room rent, and clothe herself properly—surely other employees of the Government on good salaries, with the payment of all their transportation expenses, should not be allowed \$7 a day additional for subsistence, but that \$5 would be sufficient.

Mr. GILBERT. This young lady only gives a part of her time. I would say that I am on that committee—not only in the Directory but in fact—and have examined into this matter, and I think it is a reasonable and proper allowance.

Mr. BLANTON. Has my distinguished friend and ex-jurist from Kentucky ever seen an employee of the Government who gave more than part time? Part time is the practice and custom in these days. All give part time to the Government. I was merely protesting against the extravagance of the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ENROLLING CLERK.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up a further resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 199.

Resolved, That there be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, from and after February 1, 1924, compensation at the rate now paid for the services of an enrolling clerk to act during the illness of the present incumbent.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5855) to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to two hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], the ranking member of the minority, and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5855.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to two hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Texas. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CHINDELOM in the chair.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes also to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the people of Washington and the whole Nation were startled a few days ago when the news came to them that United States Senator GREENE, of Vermont, was shot down while peacefully walking along historic Pennsylvania Avenue, literally in the shadow of the Dome of the Nation's Capitol, during a pistol battle between bootleggers and officers of the law.

This incident has done more than anything else to focus the attention of the public on the bold activities of outlaw liquor dealers and the entire question of law enforcement. Properly and rightfully the people are demanding to know why it is not safe for law-abiding citizens to walk along the best-known street in the country within almost a stone's throw of our Nation's Capitol Building, where our laws are made.

TIME TO SPEAK OUT.

I say that the time has come for some one to speak out and endeavor to place the blame on the right shoulders for the condition which made possible this outrageous occurrence. If a prohibition officer is guilty of carelessly shooting firearms, he should be punished.

But, Mr. Chairman, it seems that every effort is being made by certain interests in Washington to fix the entire responsibility on the Federal agent, who with police officers of the district, surprised a band of bootleggers who were boldly unloading a whisky still in the heart of the Nation's Capital, and when the officers came upon them, they engaged the latter in a pistol battle which resulted in the shooting of Senator GREENE.

BOOTLEGGERS FAVORED.

I regret to have to say that it appears that the effort to make the Federal prohibition agent solely responsible for this shooting is not restricted to wet committees and organizations. Immediately after the shooting the Federal agent was placed under arrest and kept in jail until late the following afternoon before being released on bond. The next morning the bootleggers who escaped the officers the night before were arrested and immediately released on bond of \$3,000 apiece, while the prohibition agent had to furnish bond for \$5,000 when he was finally given his freedom.

Why this discrimination against the officer of the law and this tenderness toward the bootleggers by officials in Washington who are supposed to uphold the law? I assert that the bootleggers who were involved in this affair should have been kept in jail without bond until all danger that Senator GREENE would lose his life had been removed. Why did not the United States District attorney here in Washington see that this was done?

BOOTLEGGERS' PATRONS MUST SHARE BLAME.

I charge that this is just an illustration of the attitude of powerful influences in the Nation's Capital toward the illegal, disgraceful, and notorious traffic in booze which has been thriving in Washington. And the greatest shame and disgrace of it all is, that there are many, so we are told, who are high in the official and political life of the Nation, people of supposed intelligence and education, those of social and financial standing who stand back of the bootlegger by patronizing their contemptible illegal business. These people of the gay night life mixing their cocktails and highballs are the first to speak in superior condemnation of the officers who take their lives in their hands when they interfere with the bold bandits who are engaged in supplying these thirsty patrons.

If these people had sufficient respect for the Federal Constitution and the law of the land to control their selfish appetites, the so-called "society" bootleggers would starve to death, and the likelihood of pitched battles on the public streets, endangering the lives of law-abiding citizens, would be almost removed. [Applause.]

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to the people of the country who would know why a United States Senator was shot down on Pennsylvania Avenue the other day, that they can first of all put the blame on the careless, indifferent, selfish patrons of the bootleggers, especially those who boast of their standing in the community and who therefore serve as examples for the poor and the ignorant to follow.

LAW OFFICERS SCORED.

Next among those who deserve the condemnation of all right-minded citizens are those public officials charged with enforcing the law, who fail to do their duty earnestly, honestly, and without fear or favor. I grant you that these officials have no easy task, but unless they are willing to do their best and try to perform their sworn duty they should surrender their places to others more ready or more competent.

The best men available should be given a free hand to enforce the law. I charge that this has not been done in Washington. Young inexperienced lawyers are assigned by the district attorney to prosecute cases against bootleggers, while the bootleggers have the best talent obtainable to defend them.

Only a few days before Senator GREENE was shot it was announced that several deputy United States marshals in the District had been suspended from office for alleged complicity with a rum-running syndicate. It does not seem to me that either the district attorney or the United States marshal take the prohibition enforcement question with sufficient seriousness.

POLITICS CAUSES TROUBLE.

Mr. Chairman, a large number of the prohibition-enforcement officers honestly try to do their duty and enforce the law, but just as long as men are appointed to the difficult task of enforcing prohibition because of political influence and backing, enforcement of the law will be neglected. Many of those appointed as prohibition-enforcement officers are not chosen for their qualifications or because they honestly believe in the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment but, by reason of strong political influence, enforcement officers have been appointed who were not in sympathy with the law. It is charged that politicians have cooperated with dishonest enforcement officers and collected their share of the spoils. It is a known fact which can not be challenged that many of the politically appointed enforcement officers, while on the pay roll of the Government have spent a large part of their time in working at the political game in the interest of the politicians who were responsible for their appointments. And this is one of the chief reasons why prohibition enforcement has not been more effective.

Politics should have no place in the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment. It is not a party question. The whole enforcement of prohibition should be taken away from the politicians and placed into the hands of some department of government under one head who would be held responsible for the enforcement of the law.

POLITICAL APPOINTEES FILL BUREAU.

The work of prohibition enforcement is hard enough without being complicated because of political obligations and entanglements. To-day the Federal prohibition bureau is full of politi-

cal appointees from the top to the bottom. The time has come when the people are going to demand that our prohibition officials see to it that the law is enforced. I have come to the conclusion that some of the officers who have been appointed are not now and never have been in sympathy with the enforcement of the provisions of the eighteenth amendment to our Constitution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Men high up in legislative activities and prominent newspapers are advocating that prohibition-enforcement officers should be disarmed. How could there be any enforcement as against armed bootleggers if we disarmed our enforcement agents?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I think the gentleman's question answers itself.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I have only a little time, and I wish the gentleman would permit me to proceed without interruption at present. Finally we have the wet propagandists themselves, who by their activities, their utterances, and their declarations encourage violation of the law.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I received an amazing communication through the mail relative to the recent unfortunate shooting of Senator GREENE.

WETS ENCOURAGE LAW VIOLATIONS.

This communication came to me from an organization styling itself the "Joint legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor, National Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, Constitutional Liberty League, and the Moderation League Incorporated." It states that James Duncan, first vice president of the American Federation of Labor is chairman, and one James C. Espy is publicity director. The committee headquarters are at the New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.

The communication which I referred to a moment ago reads, in part, as follows:

We charge that United States Prohibition Commissioner Roy A. Haynes has incited his agents to commit murder in the enforcement of the prohibition law. There are instances where Federal prohibition agents have attacked and shot innocent citizens. The indiscriminate use of firearms by the several thousand armed agents of the enforcement department has become a menace to the lives and safety of the people, and nobody has done anything about it.

We all deplore the shooting of Senator GREENE. Among his colleagues in the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives with whom he served for years with distinction and credit to his State and Nation, no party lines nor other distinctions separate us in the common shock which we experienced when the news was brought to us that he had been wounded.

LIQUOR OUTLAWS HAVE BLOODY RECORD.

But, to my mind, those who are responsible more than anyone else for this outrage are attempting to throw out a smoke screen under which they would cover their guilt and shame. The liquor outlaws have written a bloody record since the advent of prohibition. They have defied all our laws, and in the very shadow of the Nation's Capitol they were caught violating the fundamental law of the land.

This wet organization or committee which makes the public charge that the Federal prohibition commissioner has incited his agents to commit murder does not utter one word of criticism of the bootleggers who were caught in the act of unloading from an automobile a whisky still almost within a stone's throw of this Capitol Building at the point where Senator GREENE was shot. Not one word do we hear from them which even slightly reflects on these law violators.

During the last two or three years from 35 to 50 Federal officers have been killed by bootleggers and rum runners. I now challenge this organization to show where they have on any single occasion expressed any regret for the murder of these officers who were trying to carry out their sworn duty. Many of these victims were young men. They are survived by families with little children who must now face life's battle alone. Some of them fought under our flag during the World War and passed through all the major engagements of the great conflict without a scratch from the enemy, only to be murdered by bootlegging assassins after they returned home.

WETS DON'T CONDEMN BOOTLEGGERS.

Whisky runners and bootleggers killed these officers, but we do not hear one word of condemnation from the lawless liquor-traffic advocates or this organization of personal-liberty howlers

who have their headquarters at the seat of our Government in Washington and are now challenging the right of the American people to enforce laws that have been enacted by the orderly process of Government.

That such an accident to a prominent Senator should be seized upon by a wet organization for propaganda purposes is an outrage and insult to every law-abiding citizen. Their attitude gives encouragement to the bootlegger and whisky runner and to a large extent is responsible for the shooting of prohibition-enforcement officials. The demand which they make that the officers of the law shall not be permitted to defend themselves is an open invitation to every criminal in the country to violate the law with impunity. [Applause.]

Their charge that prohibition agents are invited to shoot is a falsehood, for the instructions given them are never to use firearms except in self-defense.

LIQUOR OUTLAWS SHOOT TO KILL.

How long should an officer stand as the target for the bullets of the outlaw rum runner? Shall we permit those who have no respect for the laws of the land to kill those who are trying to enforce a plain provision in the Constitution? [Applause.]

To-day we find the outlaw bootlegger and rum runner with high-powered motor cars, equipped with smoke screens to throw off pursuit. Armed to the teeth, these criminals of the liquor traffic are the most desperate and dangerous group of organized bandits in our country.

They deal in poison and ply their trade with murder and bloodshed. A short time ago these outlaws killed a Federal officer, and, not content with his death, they poured 76 shot in the dead body of their victim. These are the type of criminals who make it unsafe for law-abiding citizens to walk the streets day or night.

About two months ago, in my own State of Ohio, in the dead hour of the night, bootleggers dynamited the home of a prohibition agent, seriously injuring the officer's wife and baby. Two or three weeks later this same brave officer was stabbed to death by whisky runners in my home city. But this foul murder was not wholly unexpected, for the organized band of law violators had seryed notice that they would kill him or anyone else who attempted to interfere with them while they were plying their unlawful business.

SHOCKING MURDERS COMMITTED.

It is only a short time ago that the country was shocked by the slaying of Federal Prohibition Officer Stewart, of Buffalo. This officer was killed by the riffraff who put no value on human life. But these murders do not stop the ceaseless propaganda by the wets, who are seeking to break down the law of the land and thereby encouraging those who are engaged in bootlegging and whisky running to kill those who would balk them.

Recently the sheriff of Franklin County, Ind., was shot and killed by whisky runners whom he surprised. A patrolman of South Bend, Ind., was killed and another seriously wounded in a fight with bootleggers. Booze bandits in ambush fired on Federal officers who were returning from a raid in Floyd County, Ind., in an attempt to rescue prisoners whom they had taken. All of these are recent events; but we have not heard one word for law observance; we have not heard one word of condemnation from this so-called joint legislative committee which is trying to divert the attention of the country from the criminal to the officers of the law who are endeavoring to enforce a constitutional provision against the sale of intoxicating liquors.

WHISKY RUNNERS BUSY.

Last week an officer of the United States Coast Guard testified before a committee of Congress that the whisky runners along our coasts go armed to the teeth and frequently fire upon the Coast Guard men when the attempt is made to capture them.

I believe that Congress and the States should pass additional laws to severely punish the murderous bootlegger and whisky runner who are at large in many parts of our country, determined to kill those who try to prevent them from selling their poison liquor. [Applause.]

Let me say to this committee and the National Association Against the Prohibition Amendment and other organizations of like character that they would command greater respect from the American people if they would proceed in an orderly and lawful way to carry on their campaign for the repeal of the national prohibition act, instead of quickly coming to the defense of whisky runners and encouraging them to carry on their unlawful business.

WORKERS WON'T AID WETS.

Mr. Chairman, in closing let me say it is no credit to labor organizations to have Mr. James Duncan, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, as chairman of this wet committee. It is no credit to Mr. Duncan, who has been a leader of organized labor for years, to allow his name to be used by an organization which would nullify the Constitution of our Republic and put obstacles in the way of law enforcement. It is to be regretted by the decent, law-abiding workmen that Mr. Duncan can not find something more worth while to do for the benefit of wage earners than to place himself at the head of an organization which seeks the return of the liquor traffic, which was ever the arch enemy of the workingman and his family. [Applause.] But the workers will not assist him in this effort to flood the country with wet propaganda. He has allowed himself to be used as a tool of wet agitators who are misrepresenting the thought and attitude of the decent, sober-minded, law-abiding working classes of our Nation.

An overwhelming majority of the American wage earners stand for law and order, not for moonshine whisky and nullification. They stand for opportunity and decency, not for crime and drunkenness. [Applause.]

PROHIBITION SURE TO BE TRIUMPHANT.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to express the hope that nothing I have said here to-day will cause anyone to think that I am fearful of the future of prohibition. I am not, because I have faith in America and the American people. Our people have always met a great crisis when it came. And sooner or later the citizens of our country will be aroused and demand that the laws against the liquor traffic be fully enforced. For the sake of our country, for the sake of clean politics and good government, for the sake of the home, for humanity's sake, let all good citizens unite and put an end to present wanton disregard for the Constitution and the law of the land. [Applause.]

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE].

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I have sent a letter to the Clerk's desk, written to Commissioner Curran, which I ask the Clerk to read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 11, 1924

To Mr. CHARLY CURON

Immigration Commissioner of Ellis Island N. Y.

So I read in the newspapers that you are from Congressman Johansons group as against the Immigration and your aduers to clog the American dors for Immigration. So you should know that next year 1925 will be a democratic President in the White house and he will nok our your hed from the Immigration office he will apoint a liberal man as Imi-gration Commissioner in Ellis Island and you should remember if the Immigration law will be pasd so like you want so all the republican caundlats for offices from the President and down will be dedidet by next election—

FROM CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, partisan politics has not up to this year entered into the question of immigration legislation. It was a hundred years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence before Congress enacted any restrictive immigration laws at all, and it was only then because certain foreign countries were literally shipping their paupers and convicts to America. Later Democratic and Republican Congresses passed immigration bills only to be vetoed by Republican and Democratic Presidents. In 1917 our present basic immigration law was passed by a Democratic Congress over the veto of a Democratic President. In 1921 it was a Republican President who signed the present quota law. I want to say, as my friend and colleague from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] has just said in respect to prohibition, that there is no room for partisan politics in solving the immigration problem. It is a purely patriotic question involving American traditions and ideals. Democrats and Republicans alike, in my opinion, are equally loyal in their desire to protect America and the American people from the influx of immigrants that threaten to come to the United States at the present time. [Applause.] The partisan issue was not raised until what I term a foreign bloc raised its head and held out its votes to the Republican Party and to the Democratic Party alike, offering its support and votes to the party that would

assist them in the defeat of the immigration bill, and threatening the defeat of the other party.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABLE. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. If this bloc, which has the influence to which the gentleman has referred at this time, is permitted to increase itself in the coming years by a further influx of immigration, what sort of a situation would the gentleman anticipate we will have in four or five or ten years from now when we attempt to pass restrictive measures?

Mr. CABLE. A more difficult situation. I submit that the Democrats and the Republicans must unite in forming an "American bloc" and that neither need yield to the foreign influence.

Mr. BOX. In view of the fact that five of the seven Democrats of the House Committee on Immigration have joined in the report favoring the Johnson bill, and the probability that it will be almost solidly supported by the Democrats of the House, to what place will these gentlemen who threaten our patriotic Republican brethren be forced to go for comfort?

Mr. CABLE. They will have no place, unless they return to the foreign countries in whose nationals they seem more interested.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABLE. Yes. But before I yield I want to say that the question of partisan politics has never been raised in the House Committee on Immigration since I have been a member, and it should not have been raised in this House.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman designate the bloc in the House which the gentleman says has been formed on the immigration bill, and what pledges or promises they had made as to what legislation to defeat?

Mr. CABLE. They propose to defeat H. R. 6540. As the gentleman knows, that bill was reported to the House by the committee on February 9. Yet, according to the Boston Transcript of February 7, a report was sent from Washington to New England stating that certain Italians had come to Washington and that they had conferred with certain Congressmen, and that these Congressmen had agreed to work against the bill.

Mr. SABATH. What I want to know is the bloc in the House?

Mr. CABLE. I will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. SABATH. And on what legislation they had made a deal.

Mr. CABLE. I will answer the gentleman's question. Here is the report that was broadcasted throughout the New England States by the bloc that came here to defeat the bill:

Let me read to the gentleman the last paragraph of the special dispatch appearing in the Boston Transcript the 7th of February. After naming the Congressmen pledged against part of the bill, it states:

Mr. Petetti said that apparently Congress intends to pass the House bill. He added that if the measure should pass in its present form he was afraid the Italian voters of Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, who are practically all Republicans, will leave the party in a body. The delegation intends to return to Boston tonight to begin a series of mass meetings against the bill.

That delegation did not come here as American citizens, but as a foreign nationality or group to oppose the bill.

I have here a report from the New York Herald of February 9, the day on which the bill was reported out, wherein it is stated that Representative LaGuardia, of New York, said and predicted that if the bill passed, New York City in the next election would go 500,000 Democratic and make it impossible for the Republican vote up State to overcome the lead, thus losing the State in the Electoral College.

I repeat, partisan politics have no place in this patriotic question. It is a nonpartisan proposition, and it is a serious matter to determine who shall come to the United States and who may become American citizens. Congress must not be dictated to by a foreign bloc in framing the law.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the gentleman, but I would like to know the bloc. I understand the term "bloc" is used in Congress when a group of Members get together and fight for or against certain legislation. You have charged that there has been such a group formed here for the purpose of defeating this legislation and has made arrangements, or a deal, to support or defeat some other legislation.

Mr. CABLE. I will not yield to the gentleman to make a speech. I have made that statement before. If this newspaper report is true, these people coming from the New England States show that there is a bloc.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABLE. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman read into the Record a letter from some alien threatening the Republicans in case this restrictive law was passed. I presume the gentleman knows that we Democrats are also receiving similar letters, threatening a Republican administration if we refuse to accede to their wishes.

Mr. CABLE. Yes; that is the way the game is being played, both ends against the middle. I want to show that partisan politics has been injected into this proposition by the foreign bloc. For example, here is what Major Curran, commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island, said:

I had a telegram from a Congressman the other day demanding the admission of a certain Greek immigrant because, he said, the Greek vote in his city depended upon the admission of that immigrant, and there were 8,000 Greek votes in that city. Just what is a "Greek vote" in America? What business has it to be here?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. BLANTON, may I have five minutes more?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. CABLE. I want to call further attention to the influence that is being brought to bear. Take the city of New York, for example. The foreign stock constitute 80 per cent of the population. Only 20 per cent of the people of the city of New York are native born of native-born parentage. What happens in the city of New York? I read from the New York American of February 20, 1924, the following:

The board of aldermen yesterday unanimously adopted a resolution petitioning Congress to defeat the Johnson immigration bill.

That shows the effect of the foreign born in the United States in attempting to dictate to Congress what laws should be passed and what should be defeated.

Now, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat—what does it say? On February 16, 1924, in an editorial the St. Louis Globe-Democrat says:

Warnings that the State of New York will be lost to the Republicans next fall if the bill passes are not to be taken too seriously. The regulation of immigration has never been a partisan issue, and the humane provisions of this bill ought to appeal to rather than affront the naturalized vote in the East, whose alienation is alleged to be threatened.

The New York Times of February 26 says:

Too many of the protests against immigration restriction have been made by persons more interested in specific foreign groups or foreign nations than in the homogeneity of the United States.

According to another newspaper, it appears that foreign-language newspaper editors have organized to defeat the bill.

Not only nationals in the United States but foreign nations throughout the world are attempting to defeat this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CABLE. In a second.

According to the Columbus Dispatch of January 27, the Japanese Government has brought pressure to bear to defeat the legislation. The Columbus Dispatch says:

Japs may cancel \$200,000,000 in United States trade orders. * * * New York alien bloc ready.

The pressure of foreign governments and alien blocs on administration leaders and Members of Congress will retard formation of the new immigration bill and may lead to radical changes, if not the defeat of the bill, in the opinion of some members of the committee.

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, is opposed to this bill, and I just wanted to ask the gentleman if, in his opinion, such a propaganda as he refers to has had any effect on him in making up his mind in opposition to it?

Mr. CABLE. I respect the Secretary of State, but I can not agree with him on his proposition of admitting Japanese into the United States on a quota basis.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman think that the Secretary of State's opposition to this bill is going to retard its passage?

Mr. CABLE. I doubt it.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CABLE. Yes.

Mr. KING. I want to know, for information, whether the gentleman in his work has discovered whether or not the shipping interests of New York City, and allied shipping interests, are opposed to the bill?

Mr. CABLE. I imagine they are, because the bill would cut down their revenue.

Mr. BOX. Is opposition to restriction and proper regulation of immigration not in line with their attitude throughout the entire history of the country's efforts to deal with the problem?

Mr. CABLE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In answer to what effect statements in letters by Secretary Hughes might have on the bill, I wish to say that if the committee has time, it proposes to accept some of the administrative suggestions of the Secretary of State or amendments that might make the overseas immigration more workable. But as to the question of policy, the committee insists on the bill as it is reported, and will let the House vote up or down on the bill.

Mr. CABLE. I am glad to have the chairman make that statement.

Members of the committee, I want to call your attention to a clipping from Labor, a paper published in Washington, wherein it is stated:

Foreign nations seek to write United States immigration law. Great pressure being brought on Congress to defeat Johnson restrictive measure. Large employers, foreign governments, and so-called alien blocs in this country have turned their batteries against the bill sponsored by ALBERT JOHNSON, Representative from Washington.

From the Times-Star of Cincinnati, Ohio, of February 10, 1924. I want to read this editorial statement to the members of the committee, and particularly to the gentleman from Chicago, Mr. SABATH:

There is a foreign bloc in Washington, and it is at least as active as the other blocs. It is trying hard just now to prevent the enactment of any effective immigration legislation. On the other hand, feeling throughout the country is ten to one for restriction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, may I have one more minute?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if we could locate the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN], the gentleman might have additional time. I have already yielded the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I will take the responsibility of yielding two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. CABLE. I thank the gentleman. I have a letter here from a lawyer—who is a naturalized citizen—in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, and I want to read the concluding paragraph of that letter:

You and your "American" friends in the American Congress assembled should know and must know that, although some of us were born in foreign countries, we are not "foreigners" but loyal American citizens. We are with you in the "American bloc."

I want to commend that statement and the writer's patriotism. Many naturalized citizens are just as loyal as the native born. The mistake some make is that they attempt to use influence in the passage of legislation more in the interest of their native land than their adopted country. This immigration bill would not affect any foreign born here. I favor restrictive legislation. It will benefit all here alike, native and foreign born, alien and citizen.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABLE. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. This is a selective immigration bill.

Mr. CABLE. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Has not the gentleman found in his experience as a member of the Immigration Committee that there is a very substantial, a very large, sentiment in this country that is for the entire suspension of immigration for a period of five or ten years, and is not this bill, in a measure, a compromise with that sentiment?

Mr. CABLE. I will say to the gentleman that if the committee reported a suspension bill the House would pass it.

Mr. LINEBERGER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CABLE. This bill admits fireside relatives of American citizens outside the quota. It counts abroad instead of in New York. It will do away absolutely with the hardships of deportation as far as the quota provisions are concerned.

The national need for a further restrictive as well as selective measure is recognized in the bill. The changes proposed are not radical but necessary and may be summarized as follows:

The weaklings are weeded out abroad by means of a certificate plan and the granting to American consuls the discretion to refuse visas to those in their opinion undesirable. No families will be separated because of excess quotas, as no one

can start without a certificate, which must be used within two months from the date of issue. It also prevents the racing of huge liners across the ocean to be the first to land their passengers. By means of this certificate plan a steady flow of foreign born through Ellis Island will be possible, resulting in a more thorough and more intensive examination.

The quota is reduced from 3 to 2 per cent, so that new arrivals may be limited to our capacity to absorb them. The census of 1890 instead of that of 1910 is proposed.

No discrimination against any country can be claimed, because fathers and mothers over 55 years of age, husbands and wives of citizens of the United States, as well as their unmarried minor children under 18 years of age, are admitted as nonquota immigrants, and such persons will come chiefly from countries whose quotas will be cut.

Those who are not eligible for citizenship are not admissible, because "we have no room in this land for those who can not assume the duties and obligations of citizenship."

A minimum quota of 200 is provided for every country. Seepage of alien seamen into the United States will be stopped by means of a landing-card provision. The proposed bill reduces the number who may come from 357,000 to 169,000.

The fight for further restrictive immigration is not as yet won. The bill is not a law. Alien influence, international in character, is joining forces with "alien blocs" in the United States to prevent the passage of this measure. In large cities where the foreign born hold the balance of power, threats of political punishment have already gone out to their Congressmen in case the measure is passed.

In addition, the work is not complete. Congress should continue the constructive program by adding to the quota the nationals of Mexico. A law should be passed penalizing the thousands of aliens who are smuggled into this country in defiance of our law. The only legal remedy now available is deportation, and that is seldom used because of lack of funds.

Enact a law placing the alien bootlegger in the class with the other deportable aliens. Permit the confiscation of airplanes, automobiles, and ships now used in the business of smuggling aliens into the United States. Establish patrols along the many unguarded highways leading into this country and at the same time conduct a thorough survey of our penal institutions to ascertain the undesirable alien and deport him.

Our Nation, neither economically nor socially, needs more immigrants, but it does need to make good citizens of aliens now here. This is best accomplished by the restrictive policy of this bill. America must be kept American.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the bloc which has been created by my friend and colleague from Ohio—

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. CABLE. I will say this: It was the foreign born who came here before the bill was reported out that opposed the organization of an American bloc to protect American principles and ideals under American laws. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. I venture to say that all of the gentlemen who came and appeared before the committee are just as loyal and just as law abiding as any voters or citizens in the gentleman's district, and you nor anyone else needs to fear that American principles and ideals are in any danger by anything that they have done or may do in the future.

What I desire to say is this: That the bloc is a creation in the suspicious mind of the gentleman who has given birth to the foreign bloc in the interview he gave out and in the statement he made here some time ago.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you all, as well as myself, were very much amused when the gentleman from Ohio had the letter, purporting to come from some foreign born, addressed to the commissioner at Ellis Island, read. As you observed, it was signed "Citizen" and typewritten. Does not that appear a little suspicious? Of course, I would not even insinuate that my colleague would for a moment doubt that such letter had actually been written, but I do firmly believe that it was written—not by a foreign-born citizen—but by one of those busy professional restrictionists with a view of being utilized and, perhaps, even read by some one on the floor not only for political reasons but for the purpose of creating prejudice in the minds of the Members of the House, and this would not be unusual because at all times while immigration bills are being considered, statements, articles, yes, even statistics, are being manufactured to be utilized to mislead the American people against immigration.

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I have only five minutes.

Mr. CABLE. I have the original letter here which the commissioner gave me.

Mr. SABATH. I have only five minutes. Now, the gentleman from California, and, of course, as Californians feel the same way, they are continuously fearful and afraid of the future of our Nation. Well, I want to say to him—

Mr. LINEBERGER. I want to correct the gentleman. We are not afraid of anything, but we want to protect the Nation.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman should not be afraid of anything.

Mr. LINEBERGER. We are afraid of this bloc more than anything else.

Mr. SABATH. I assure the gentleman he does not need to lose any sleep or be afraid of this bloc, because there is no such thing in existence that I know of. I have been a member of this committee for 16 years; this is my seventeenth year, and if there were such a bloc I believe I would know about it; in this, I believe, even the gentleman from Ohio will agree that I hide nothing and usually say things as they are to the best of my ability.

Mr. CABLE. I will say to the House that the gentleman is a good member of the committee, but we do not usually vote the same way.

Mr. SABATH. No; we do not always agree, and that is because the gentleman does not really understand the fundamental principle involved in the great question. [Applause.]

I have believed, and I believe now—

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. In one second. I am of the firm opinion and belief that notwithstanding the frequent unjustified charges that are being made against immigration our country in no way has suffered from it, but, on the contrary, has been greatly benefited. It is not only the present-day immigration but the immigration of a hundred, eighty, sixty, and forty years ago was obliged and did perform the hardest and the most common work which helped to upbuild our country. It has been employed in the forests and in the fields, in the mines, in the shops and plants, and has in every way aided and assisted in developing the wealth of our Nation. Not only has the immigrant helped to create, but he materially aided in finding an outlet for our surpluses, which has made our country the envy of the world, not only rich and prosperous, but the best country to live in.

The so-called "new" immigrant beyond doubt has clearly proven and demonstrated his loyalty to our country, to our flag, and to our institutions, and it is manifestly unfair that not only he but those of foreign parentage should be condemned on the floor of the House by a certain few gentlemen who make it appear that they are undeserving or that the Nation, as is so often stated, is in imminent danger from them.

Of course, I had not expected that this gentleman from Ohio would deliver his immigration speech, so ably prepared, at this time. In the near future I am going to answer him and others at length. Then I will show the gentleman from Ohio and some of my colleagues from the South, as well as from the Pacific coast, that they unnecessarily fret and that they are in error when they try to make the Nation believe that the newer immigration is inferior to the older immigration, and I will not only go back to the immigration of the eighties and sixties but for their information I will read statements and reports made by men who, like they, looked with apprehension to the then coming immigration, and I know that the Members and the country will be amused when they read the unkind things that were said of the immigrants who were charged with overrunning our cities and filling our penal institutions in 1670. And when opportunity presents itself I shall also read some of the reports about the immigrants who were coming in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. Not with the intention, of course, to reflect upon them or the splendid citizenship of our country but merely to bring to the attention of the House and the country how some gentlemen even in those early years have been carried away with prejudice as some are to-day, and that the praise given to the earlier immigration was not forthcoming then, and for that purpose alone I insert, having the opportunity to extend my remarks, an extract from pages 18, 19, 20, and 21 of the second annual report of the managers of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, dated New York City, December, 1819:

First. As to emigrations from foreign countries, the managers are compelled to speak of them in the language of astonishment and apprehension. This inlet of pauperism threatens us with the most overwhelming consequences.

And this in the report of 1819, over 100 years ago:

The present state of Europe contributes in a thousand ways to vast and unceasing emigration to the United States. A universal shock of commercial embarrassment has pervaded, and still pervades the continent of Europe. The whole system of trade and exchange is affected; internal industry directed to new objects; nations are manufacturing for themselves, and abandoning the usual resorts; armies and navies are disbanded and labor-saving machinery is daily lessening the necessity of manual industry. Hence an almost innumerable population beyond the ocean is cast out of employment, and this has the effect of increasing the usual want of employ. This country is the resort of vast numbers of these needy and wretched beings. Thousands are continually resting their hopes on the refuge which she offers, filled with the delusive visions of plenty and luxury. They seize the earliest opportunity to cross the Atlantic and land upon our shores. Many arrive here destitute of everything. When they do arrive, instead of seeking the interior, they cluster in our cities, or sojourn along our seaboard, depending on the incidents of time, charity, or depredation, for subsistence.

And this in the report, 1819:

On application by one of the managers to his honor the mayor, he states that from the 1st day of March, 1818, to the 1st day of November, 1819, there have been 35,560 passengers who have arrived in vessels at the city of New York, and been reported at his office, of these, 18,930 are foreigners. How many others have crossed our frontier lines, and arrived by way of the Canadas, or how many thousands have evaded our laws, which requires a report of each person on landing, we can not say, but the chief magistrate of this city has calculated that the number of 18,000 and upward, does not include more than two-thirds of the real number; and after making every reasonable deduction, this would give as an aggregate of more than 28,000 who have arrived at this port in 20 months. What has been the destination of this immense accession of population, and where is it now? Many of these foreigners may have found employment; some may have passed into the interior; but thousands still remain among us. They are frequently found destitute in our streets; they seek employment at our doors; they are found in our almshouse and in our hospitals; they are found at the bar of our criminal tribunals, in our bridewell, our penitentiary, and our State prison. And we lament to say that they are too often led by want, by vice, and by habit, to form a phalanx of plunder and depredation, rendering our city more liable to the increase of crimes, and our houses of correction more crowded with convicts and felons. For years and generations will Europe continue to send forth her surplus population. The winds and the waves will still bring needy thousands to our seaports, and this city continue the general point of arrival. Over this subject can we longer slumber? Shall we behold a moral contagion spreading and expanding with the most inveterate ravages amid the ranks of our growing population, without endeavoring to arrest its progress? Shall this mass suddenly be identified with ourselves and our children, inculcating their habits and their principles, without an anxious effort on our part to stay the impending calamity?

And this is a part of report made in the year 1819!

Mr. Chairman, all I want, or, rather, will say to you to-day is this: You ought not to accuse Secretary Hughes because he has sent in the letter or report pointing out the defects in the bill. He was obliged to do that, and any honest Secretary would be obliged to do the same thing. He pointed out in his report that the bill is violative of our treaties with foreign governments, and there is no question about that. He pointed out that it is a discriminatory bill, and there is no question about that.

I hope in the near future, when you gentlemen who are sane on the question of immigration will read unbiased reports, you will come to the conclusion that he was right and that the bill that was reported by the committee was discriminatory and violative of our treaties with the foreign governments.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Can I have two more minutes?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNERY. Does not my colleague from Illinois know that the President of the United States told a delegation which came here to visit him, as quoted in the newspapers a few days ago, that he was against any bill which would discriminate against any nation in particular, and does not this bill discriminate particularly against southern Europe in contradistinction to northern Europe?

Mr. SABATH. So I have been informed, but, as I have stated, the bill does discriminate against the so-called newer

immigration, because it is based on the census of 1890 instead of 1920; and that is done for the purpose, as I say, of keeping out as many of the newer immigrants, or people of that kind of immigration which has been designated as the newer immigration. In connection with that I want to say to you that the records will clearly demonstrate that there is no danger or need of fear from the newer immigration. They have demonstrated their loyalty and patriotism to the same extent that the older immigration has.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. But, of course, the advocates of restriction, and especially those who believe there should be no immigration, must have something, and consequently they send out from day to day statements, interviews, and misleading articles to prejudice the minds of the American people against the so-called newer immigration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINEBERGER. May the gentleman have another minute? I want to ask him a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman said the 1890 bill discriminates against the so-called newer immigration.

Mr. SABATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. LINEBERGER. If that is true, would not the 1910 basis, which I understand the gentleman is in favor of, discriminate against the older immigration?

Mr. SABATH. No; it would not.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Who were the original American stock.

Mr. SABATH. What do you call the original stock?

Mr. LINEBERGER. From northwestern Europe.

Mr. SABATH. No; it would not. It would give them the same percentage; in fact, it would give them a larger number of immigrants than the 1890, and there would be no discrimination.

Mr. LINEBERGER. There would be a discrimination in ratio, however, if 1910 is adopted instead of 1890.

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. HOLADAY. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Can I have three more minutes to answer some of these questions?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HOLADAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that these alien groups, organized as a particular alien group, appearing before the committee and putting out propaganda in behalf of their native land against the action of the American Congress, are doing more to stir up prejudice against them than anything else?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I do agree with the gentleman that some of these overanxious gentlemen coming down here and pleading for fair play and against discrimination creates a prejudice, but it should not, because they are sincere and honest men. They are well-meaning men. They do not mean to do any harm; but they do not realize that you gentlemen look upon them with suspicion and believe they are undeserving of being permitted to appear before the Committee on Immigration or any other committee and state their grievance. That is their right and privilege, and you should not resent it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. SABATH was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a bill which will carry on some of the restrictive provisions of the present quota law, which would expire on June 30, must be passed soon through this body and through the Senate. It must be apparent to all Members and citizens generally that as the weeks go by, bringing us closer to the time when such a restrictive law, which was the first one ever signed by any President, expires, that the issue will become more and more keen.

Nothing breeds so much trouble as racial differences. There is nothing which makes such vicious debate as religious prejudice. Therefore if the membership of this House which desires to act for the good of the United States will, as these debates come on and as letters and telegrams pour in, and as the issue becomes more and more clear cut, begin to sort up and classify the varying forms of opposition and endeavor to see why this kind of opposition and why that kind of opposition and how all opposition is bound together, we shall be prepared

to exercise good judgment when the time comes to vote on the restrictive immigration bill.

I believe now more firmly than ever that races will stick together. There must be some reason. In Europe, where there is so much trouble, often when you cross a river you step from one nation to another nation. You find the people not only speaking a different language but hating the people on the other side of the river with all their might, as they have hated them for a thousand years; and, to my mind, as we come in the United States to a reflex of these disturbances in connection with an effort to restrict immigration, and when we hear the appeals of various peoples calling themselves this or that hyphenated type of American, we can see what we are breeding in the United States if we do not act now while the opportunity is ours. [Applause.]

There is no malice and there is no attempt at discrimination and no hatred in the bill which is on the calendar (H. R. 7995). A situation has arisen and that bill meets it. I have taken occasion in years past to say to those who come with special appeals in behalf of special peoples who seem to think that because they have arrived in the United States the people they left behind in other countries have vested rights in the United States, that each time the House Committee on Immigration labors on a bill to restrict immigration the provisions are made a little more restrictive. This is clearly in response to the public demand, which has become nation-wide, and if this thing keeps on and the challenge becomes more bitter, I feel sure that the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman will, if it makes any change in the bill at all, make it still more restrictive. [Applause.] Many Members of the House want a bill completely suspending immigration.

But, my friends, when you come to write a bill suspending immigration you find you can not write one unless you suspend the treaties with all nations. So you have to make exemptions to cover the requirements of all the treaties, and then make exemptions for visitors, for sailors, for wives and children, and soon you make so many exemptions that you destroy the plan of suspension. A small quota is the better plan.

I am only one member of the committee and only one Member of this great House, but if I could write a bill I would restrict the quota almost to the vanishing point, and then I would admit the bona fide wives and children—the unmarried children under 18 of the people in the country prior to April 1, 1924, or any other date certain. In that way we could clean house and help those now here to establish their homes. To my mind there is nothing gained in bringing new people, new immigrants, without their wives and children, and then denying them the opportunity or privilege of bringing their actual immediate families. I hope some day that those who are working the hardest to solve the immigration question will see that.

The preamble to our Constitution starts with "We, the people of the United States." That takes care of all the people here. We do not say "citizens," but we say "people," and we mean "people." That being so, the quicker we decide to be a little more careful as to who are admitted as "people of the United States" the more certain we shall be as to the future of the United States. If we continue to admit great numbers of those who fail to assimilate, we will be in danger of ourselves being assimilated. Our customs will be changed for us. Indeed, that very thing is happening in many localities. Entire political subdivisions have become so beholden to the views of the new arrivals—even of those who do not vote—that a rational consideration of the immigration problem is out of the question. When we read the authentic and official reports as to the great numbers of those who are trying to get to the United States from central Europe, we should realize that the quicker we shut down immigration to the vanishing point the better off we will be. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the people here should know something about the proposition of Mussolini, of Italy, for the establishment of a new kind of Italian savings bank in this country for the benefit of the people in Italy. The people in the United States should know why the Italian wives and children do not come here.

Let us try to pass a law which will be for the good of the United States to-day, to-morrow, and for all time, and let us do it without malice, without regard to the threats to sabotage any political party. If we do not do it no political party, either Democratic or Republican, will be safe from similar attack. In New York City to-day to elect men to high places you put up one man with a foreign name naturalized on one ticket and another man with a foreign name on the other ticket, and you call such candidates Republican or Democrat as best fits the situation. No good can come of such low politics. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if every once in a while we could get from some foreign government an immigrant from the many thousands who come to this country, a citizen who would become as good a citizen and as valuable and honorable a citizen as our distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], there might be some excuse for opening wide the doors and having no restrictions. He is a valuable citizen. Some of his colleagues may not know it, but last year from his farm he raised over 100,000 baskets of potatoes to help feed this Nation. [Applause.] Last year from his farm he raised nearly 150,000 baskets of onions to help feed the Nation. I approve of such a citizen as Brother SABATH, but I believe, as our friend from Ohio [Mr. CABLE] said, that if the question was put fairly up to this House, not by a compromise bill from this committee, but put fairly and squarely before the House to protect the rights of just such citizens as the gentleman from Illinois, I believe the House would pass a bill to suspend immigration for at least five years in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to state that there are hundreds of thousands much better men and much more deserving men, who came the same way I did, right in the United States than I am.

Mr. BLANTON. Where you get one good citizen like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] we get thousands of anarchistic Bolsheviks who would tear down and destroy the Government of the United States.

Now, I can not pass on without referring to the splendid speech delivered by our colleague from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] this morning. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] and myself differ on a great many subjects. We have voted against each other on a great many occasions. He does not agree with me many times, and he has fought against me across this aisle on numerous occasions. But I have learned to love him since I have been in the House. I do not know a braver man in this House than our distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. COOPER]. There is not a more loyal citizen, there is not a more patriotic citizen, who stands here day after day fighting for the best interests of the Nation. I appreciate a man like that, even when I sometimes differ with him, and I say God speed him in the splendid work he is doing.

But I must get down to the bill we now have under discussion.

Mr. Chairman, the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia have given their promise to Congress that if we will pass this salary bill granting them adequate compensation they will furnish Washington, the Nation's Capital, with the most up-to-date, efficient, law-enforcing police force in the United States. If they will do this, it will be money well spent. I am in favor of giving them a trial.

We have been told that present salaries do not attract enough men of high character and necessary qualifications to fill the ranks, but that with the increases granted by this bill eliminations may be made of any members of the force who may be inefficient, unqualified, or careless in law enforcement and the personnel brought up to 100 per cent good.

There are some men on this force who are careless, for on their beats exists dives where the law is daily violated. I have had occasion to check up on them where complaints came to me from citizens. I know of one such place where it is reliably reported that the proprietor has been arrested three times, and immediately after releasing himself by giving a small bond has resumed his business of selling liquor that intoxicates, with a crowd of young men hanging around his establishment each afternoon and night, notwithstanding that I personally brought these complaints to the attention of the superintendent and inspector. A vigilant police should be able to put such a lawbreaker out of business by arresting him every time he opened up.

It has become so dangerous to walk across the streets of Washington that every time you start across the street one of these taxicabs that operate here now is liable to run over you. There is no attempt whatever made in the city of Washington to regulate the speed, especially of these black and white taxicabs. All of them are bad enough. I want you colleagues of mine to watch them every time you go out on the streets of Washington and you will see that they are darting here and

there, driving all the way at from 25 miles to 40 miles per hour in certain parts of the city with little children out in the streets.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is not the reason they paint them black and white so that you can see them? You could hardly see them if they were not so painted, they go so fast.

Mr. BLANTON. The law that regulates speeding is just as applicable to the black and white taxicabs and to every other kind of taxicab as it is to every other kind of an automobile that runs in the city. I say that the policemen of the city of Washington must stop it. They are winking at those taxicab companies. They are granting them immunities and special privileges. They are letting them violate the law every day for some reason, I know not what, and they ought to enforce the law as to them as well as to individuals.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. KING. I wonder if the gentleman has made any investigation of the monopoly of the standing space in front of the Union Station by the black and white taxicabs.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I have mentioned that on the floor a dozen times. Even a Representative or Senator in his own car can not drive into the Union Station without going in a side way. The main passage there next to the station is reserved exclusively for the black and white taxicabs. If a man goes there in his own car, he has to go into the second or third or fourth driveway, and then walk in between privileged taxicabs to get into the station. He can not go into the main driveway, because that is reserved for the black and white taxicabs. Nor can any other taxi enter there. The President's car itself would not be permitted to drive in there, because the black and white taxicab has a monopoly there which it enjoys; and these busses do not observe the traffic rules and pay no attention to the rights of individuals. The police force must enforce the laws. Unless, Mr. Chairman, the Metropolitan police force does clean up and does eliminate the careless, indifferent, and inefficient policemen and force every policeman to be active on his beat and promptly suppress all violations, I am going to be the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill to abolish the salary of the superintendent and to cut in half the salary of every policeman in Washington. This must be made the model police force in the Nation. It must set the pace in law enforcement. It must lead, so that all other forces may follow. If I did not have confidence in these men and did not believe they would do this and make good, I would not support this bill.

But, Mr. Chairman, believing that this bill will pass without opposition, I desire to use my time in discussing another matter that may soon come before us.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I suggest that the gentleman try the other alternative and double the salaries of the policemen and he might find a more effective force.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, we are giving a very substantial raise of all salaries in this bill. That is what I have been discussing. We are doing that with the hope that they will make their promise good and make the police force here the best in the Nation. We are giving them all substantial raises, from the superintendent down to the lowest grade of policemen on the force.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. How does the gentleman expect the police of Washington to keep order under the worst-lighted street system of any city of its size in the United States?

Mr. BLANTON. That is a matter which we will take up on another occasion. I want now to discuss the garden-seed ghost.

GARDEN-SEED GHOST.

Mr. Chairman, on January 3, 1923, a motion was made to recommit the Agriculture appropriation bill in order to add to same \$360,000 for free garden seed. I made a point of order against it. The Speaker sustained the point of order. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] appealed from the decision of the Chair, and by a vote of 173 to 85 the membership of the House sustained the Speaker in his decision, which prevented this \$360,000 garden-seed item from going in the bill. This stopped free garden seed.

Early in December the press reported that in this Congress the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] would introduce his bill to make this \$360,000 garden-seed appropriation permanent law, appropriated annually. Shortly after this the newspapers all over Texas began publishing notices about this Langley garden-seed bill.

And after the people became apprised of the fact that some Members of Congress had in contemplation the resumption of the practice of permitting Congressmen and Senators to mail out to the people under their franks \$360,000 worth of free garden seed, I want to read to you colleagues some of the protests against same which I have received.

WHAT THE PEOPLE AT HOME THINK.

Here is a protest I received from one part of Jones County:
 LUEDERS, TEX., December 17, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: We have noticed in the public press that there is to come before the House a bill to try to start again the garden-seed graft and thus increase taxes on the people. We, the undersigned citizens in your district; ask that you do all in your power to prevent its passage, as we feel that we have all the expenses in the way of taxation that we are able to bear. We ask that you do all you can to get your worthy colleagues to defeat it:

I. Z. Brown, M. D.; Berry M. Campbell, druggist; M. G. George, farmer; S. W. Seaman, oil driller; J. A. White, merchant; C. A. Douthitt, ginmer; W. F. Terry, restaurant; N. J. Tosh, druggist; Mrs. M. J. Brown, gardener; J. N. Loop, farmer; J. H. Lee, bookkeeper; Charles Stillmire, banker; B. U. Fox, merchant; H. L. Brown, restaurant; B. E. Compton, farmer; Frank H. Herrick, editor; J. E. Powell, teacher; Charles Webb, clerk; J. J. Gentry, pastor Baptist church; T. R. Putnam, merchant; Ray Rushing, farmer; Albert Hansen, clerk; W. C. Smart, farmer; H. E. Herrick, merchant; T. M. Smart, druggist; R. Dunlap, M. D.; E. L. Loudder, M. D.; J. R. Carrell, merchant; Mrs. T. M. Smart, clerk; G. W. Price, farmer; W. C. Herrington, farmer; Oscar F. Seth, farmer; T. F. Murry, restaurant; O. B. Cotton, clerk; G. F. Vaughn, shoe maker; A. Fitzgerald, merchant; C. G. Covery, farmer; B. J. Fickel, machinist; Mrs. Sarah Sharbutt; R. W. Harper.

The above list fairly represents the citizenship of this splendid community. The following comes from San Saba County:

SAN SABA, TEX., December 22, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I am herewith inclosing you a protest against the reenactment of the free garden seed bill.

This protest is signed by the very best element of citizenship of this county, representing nearly every avocation. Nearly every man, woman, and child here would sign this protest eagerly. The spirit an expression of the people are against this foolish proposition. This extravagant expenditure of the people's money is a mock pretense of Congress to do benefit to the people of the country. A majority of us are strictly against this measure and hope that it will be defeated.

With best wishes and kind regards, I am,

Yours truly,

W. C. EDWARDS.

PETITION.

SAN SABA, TEX., December 19, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There has recently appeared in press reports a strong intimation that the "free garden seed" act would at this session of Congress be attempted to be reenacted.

We the undersigned wish to protest against this useless bill because in our opinion the benefits are not commensurate with the expenditures. Respectfully,

W. C. Edwards, ranchman; S. J. Bross, county surveyor; C. A. Harkey, county treasurer; George W. Horton, secretary chamber of commerce; G. L. Huckaby, county school superintendent; A. B. Wilson, county attorney; W. A. Smith, editor the News; W. V. Dean, county judge; Edgar T. Neal, sheriff of county; E. L. Rector, ex-State senator; T. A. Murray, president City National Bank; Mrs. Eddie Williams, clerk district court; J. K. Rector, attorney; Mitch Johnson, attorney; Dr. Ira O. Stone; Dr. J. L. Dalley; Dr. William S. Bickham; Leonard A. Skaggs, druggist; W. A. Ashley, ranchman; J. E. Rainey, farmer; T. J. Burnham, farmer; W. H. Kimbrough, merchant; James W. Cummins, merchant; W. G. Jarvis, optometrist; G. A. Walters, jr., abstractor; H. B. Clark, clerk; W. R. Hines, merchant; B. D. Sullivan, merchant; O. L. Gray, ranchman; W. L. White, clerk; H. D. Chadwick, clerk; Rev. E. E. Giesler; C. B. Lambert, farmer; W. W. Whitley, ranchman; R. Terry, farmer; Arch Woods, clerk county court.

I think that includes every officer in that county.

I have a protest sent me by Mr. E. C. Brand, of Hamlin, Tex., in which he says:

I hope to see the day when Congress will be filled with men who will try to preserve the finances of our country as they do their own, or, in other words, before they spend a dollar of the people's money, ask themselves the question, if the dollar belonged to them in person, would they expend it in such a manner.

With reference to this garden seed, we think that it is money thrown away. For instance, in talking with three men in my office yesterday two of them told me that they had received garden seed from the Government and they were stored away unused. The writer in a clean-up at home two or three days ago ran across several packages. I sincerely hope that if this seed graft bill comes up again you will use every effort to defeat it. Attached you will find a petition signed by a few of our leading citizens who ask that you protest against this graft. I believe that 90 per cent of the farmers in your district are against it.

PETITION.

HAMLIN, TEX., December 18, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned farmers and business men petition that you use every effort to defeat the garden seed bill, as we believe that it is a waste to the taxpayer. We think that it is a useless expenditure and doubt that over one-third of the seed are ever planted. Your efforts will be appreciated.

T. F. Holman, C. S. Low, E. C. Brand, Lewis Boyd, W. R. Townsend, J. A. Feagan, J. C. Bledsoe, O. H. Berry, D. M. Poe, J. B. Eakin, Fred Sledge, G. L. Barnett, H. M. Payne, W. L. Hunter, D. O. Sauls, Lennie Greenway, G. H. Tumlin, R. G. Bowdry, Pat Henry, S. C. Ferguson, J. P. Terrill, H. Fields, Dr. J. E. Taylor, T. Cooper, W. M. Hinton.

The following, Mr. Chairman, was received from Taylor County:

To the Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned citizens and qualified voters of Taylor County, Tex., respectfully ask that you exert every legitimate effort in opposing the free-seed bill when it comes up in Congress.

G. T. Robinson, B. W. Ellison, F. A. Walden, R. L. Shepard, W. R. Gilbreth, B. T. Chrane, M. C. Rampp, J. H. Kading, R. E. Longacre, A. B. Lewis, C. E. Taylor, J. R. Hardwick, W. C. Davis, J. E. McCarty, S. C. Bright, D. Booth, J. A. Labett, H. M. Stevens, T. C. Tibbs, G. C. Welch, T. J. Colley, J. L. Richardson, J. P. Davis, Lon Lockley, Sam Gilbreth, C. K. Kirkendall, J. W. Smith, F. M. Smothers, M. R. Street, W. M. Webb, J. D. Ayres, P. H. Hollingshead, T. C. Cox, C. B. Bynum, Luther Rogers, J. M. Plowman, C. M. Bell, H. C. Callaway, W. D. Ross, W. J. Hodges, G. A. Chrane, W. T. Lindley, R. P. Bright, W. E. Carter, M. E. Williams, T. J. Key, J. D. Rodgers, Ben Holmes, R. J. Donald, J. W. Caton, J. L. Reynolds, Wm. Slaughter, sr., C. F. Latham, A. Hefferman, N. A. Cummings, W. E. Biggers, L. A. Petree, V. T. Babston, S. B. Brannan, A. B. Smothers, L. F. Spencer, J. P. Davis, D. F. Downing, C. D. Varnell, C. Putman, H. A. McMinns, E. E. Wood, W. O. Mobley, C. P. Abbott, S. C. Eager, B. P. Smothers, J. D. Abbott, T. A. Fuqua, W. F. Utzman, M. C. Bynum, B. C. Plowman, J. F. Reed.

I received the following protest from Mr. R. E. Bradbury, editor of the Lometa Reporter, and who formerly edited the Mullin Enterprise:

[From the Lometa Reporter]

LOMETA, TEX., December 19, 1923.

Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLANTON: From press reports we learn that Congress will soon take up for consideration the measure to appropriate an exceedingly large sum in order that the people might be supplied with a few free garden seeds, a practice that is considered very foolish by most every person receiving them. From a sensible and economical standpoint we hope the measure will be defeated this time as it was during the last session. It is a needless waste and we feel confident that you will fight it to a cold finish. Multitudes of others are of the same opinion.

I have talked to hundreds of people living in Brown, Mills, and Lampasas Counties about this waste and not one appreciates the seeds that are usually sent out, and the Congressmen who fosters such a proposition is surely to be pitied.

Find a better use for the people's money than buying a few packages of garden seeds that, if planted, will never come up.

Wishing you and family a merry Christmas and a happy New Year, and may you live to give a century more of service in Congress.

I am, yours sincerely,

R. E. BRADBURY.

The following protest was sent me by one of the leading citizens of Anson, Tex.:

ANSON, TEX., December 15, 1923.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned citizens of Jones County, Tex., learning that there will be an attempt made to again pass a bill or get an appropriation for the distribution of garden seed, do hereby protest against such action on the part of Congress, and call upon you to defeat same if possible.

We understand that this matter costs the Government about a half a million dollars annually, or something near that sum, and by itself it probably would not affect to any great extent the vast number of taxpayers in the United States, yet it is one item among many items of the kind which is useless, and when taken together with all such items in the aggregate constitutes a big sum, which eliminated from the annual appropriation bills would relieve the taxpayers of this country. Besides it is not good policy or good morals to waste the public money for any purpose, and we hereby call upon you to use your best endeavors to defeat such a bill.

Barrett Brasher, John B. Thomas, T. J. Barrett, W. O. Vornack, J. C. Edwards, R. L. Smith, J. H. Barrett, T. J. Stubbs, Frank Powell, Claude Grace, Ed Altman, C. F. Harper, A. L. Cole, Charles F. Murray, M. C. Meyers, J. L. Neville, George H. Baker, E. J. Ryd, J. H. Holt, J. R. Thompson, J. A. Mills, W. F. McDuff, F. A. Arnold, W. S. Pope, Sid L. Castle, Clyde S. Brooks, G. A. Gray, Owen Thomas (district clerk), Lee McCaleb, S. A. Palmer, O. W. Lasevee, A. M. McCraight, P. F. Willis, R. L. Alexander, A. McK. Jones, M. D., J. C. Ingran.

The following protest was sent me by one of the leading citizens of Bradshaw, Tex.:

BRADSHAW, TEX., January 5, 1924.

To the honorable body of Representatives of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States:

We do hereby petition you as follows:

"From press reports some Members of Congress are again organizing their forces to pass at this Congress their \$300,000 garden seed graft bill, which was defeated last year. These seeds are practically worthless, and a great expense is attached to sending them out. We must curtail expenses if we desire a tax reduction. If this \$300,000 is expended annually for these seeds, there must necessarily be collected a like amount in taxes from the people to pay the bill. Therefore we, the undersigned citizens and taxpayers of this town, do hereby enter our protest against this bill and petition you to defeat it, as it is a needless expenditure—one that is sapping the American taxpayer's pocketbook."

N. B. Bailey, J. T. Boon, M. D.; Joe Poindexter, C. J. Pfor, W. M. Oldham, S. W. Browne, W. J. Harrington, J. H. B. Polloch, W. P. Hancock, H. Grissett, J. M. Smallwood, W. G. Daniel, Homer Traylor, Guy Taylor, L. J. Hardin, W. L. Pratt, R. W. Smith, E. G. Allen, W. H. Cochran, H. A. Parrels, J. J. Watts, A. F. Henge, B. Y. Howze, H. B. Turner, F. P. McCarland, J. S. Thornton, A. I. Bagmell, J. D. Halsell, Joe Floyd, L. E. Turnbow, L. H. Turnbow, J. F. Crow, C. F. Smith, L. H. Smith, J. F. Sanders, Geo. Lent, A. J. Ware, P. R. Gerlach, M. R. Bagmell, J. B. Berton, R. C. Malone, C. B. Poindexter.

I received the following protest from Dr. T. Richard Sealy, one of the leading physicians of Coleman County:

SANTA ANNA, TEX., December 22, 1923.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: From recent press dispatches we note that there will be an effort made to reestablish the old custom of spending about one-half million dollars of the Government money so that each and every Congressman may send to Bill Jones or Sy Smith free garden seed.

From my own personal experience and that of many hundreds of your constituents with whom I have talked, we believe this to be a wasteful expenditure of money and should not be permitted. We further believe that if Congress would assist to cut out entirely and cut

down immensely, particularly in the number of unnecessary Government employees, that it would be unnecessary for the Government to assess the present high tax rate, for by your plan you are cutting down expenses and when you do that you make it unnecessary for so much income.

Please let me have a personal letter from you concerning your campaign for Congress in your old district next year, if you have decided to make the race again. If you do decide to run again, I am for you, as always in the past, even though we do have an avowed candidate here in my own county, who is my neighbor and friend.

Very truly yours,

T. RICHARD SEALY.

I received the following protest from one of the leading merchants and business men of Brown County:

BROWNWOOD, TEX., December 21, 1923.

MR. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLANTON: I have been noticing for several years the comments of the press on the practice of Congressmen distributing garden seed over the country. I consider this an absolute waste of the people's money, and am writing you to ask that you register a protest against this for the people.

There may be some short-sighted people who receive these seed thinking they have gotten something for nothing, who are pleased with this pork-barrel system of trying to get votes, but any man with brains enough to think knows that these seeds cost more than if raised by private individuals or corporations, and each individual certainly should select the seeds needed in his garden to a better advantage and to his liking than his Congressman could possibly do. Besides, seed shipped over the country by freight is certainly a more economical way of distributing than to dribble them out through the mails. I assure you that there are very few people ignorant enough in these enlightened times to think this wasteful system does not cost them anything.

I believe that it is the duty of the people in charge of our affairs to put a stop to this awful humbug business.

I am inclosing the names of several of my friends who join me in this protest, and I will say to you frankly that not a single individual approached on this subject has favored the continuance of Congressmen dishing out garden seed.

Yours truly,

W. G. BAXTER.

MR. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BLANTON. Yes.

MR. ALLEN. I just want to ask if those petitioners to whom the gentleman has referred are his constituents?

MR. BLANTON. Yes; every one of them; but I have a whole bunch of others in my office, among which are some from the constituents of other Congressmen.

MR. ALLEN. Did the gentleman send those constituents seed?

MR. BLANTON. Yes; I have done it in the past, before we stopped the practice last year.

MR. ALLEN. Does not that indicate very strongly that the people to whom the seed was sent are not garden men, they are not farmers, but they are officers, as the gentleman suggested?

MR. BLANTON. If my friend will read their names in the Record to-morrow morning, he will see that many of them sign their names as farmers.

MR. ALLEN. But doctors seldom use seed.

MR. BLANTON. Sometimes they do. I can not yield further. I did not attempt in my time to read their vocations, but the vocations of many of these petitioners are stated opposite their names, and the gentleman can see that a great percentage of them are farmers.

MR. ALLEN. I think the gentleman said that they were all officers of a county.

MR. BLANTON. Oh, I merely said that one list embraced every officer of San Saba County. But it likewise embraced men of all vocations. Here is one sent me by one of the leading merchants of Brown County.

MR. KING. What is his business?

MR. BLANTON. He is a general merchant.

MR. LILLY. He sells seed?

MR. BLANTON. He may; I do not know. Here is the petition:

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned citizens of Brownwood, Tex., ask that you please do all in your power to stop the wasteful practice of distributing garden seed over the country at the expense of the

people. We do not believe that the people receive benefits to justify the amounts expended by this practice.

H. G. Baxter, Glennie-Patterson, Erva Sinclair, Mrs. Fred L. Hayes, B. H. Baxter, Mrs. W. R. Cooper, Henry Keith, W. F. Anrich, J. Waldo Carson, B. E. Anthony, Eba Carson, H. F. Hunter, T. P. Kelly, J. L. Lane, Geo. Gardenhire, Mrs. B. F. Anthony, Mrs. B. H. Baxter, H. F. Hunter, Mrs. H. F. Hunter, J. F. Hunter.

The following protest was sent to me by Mr. C. T. Beckham, one of the leading farmers and citizens of Trent, Tex.:

TRENT, TEX., December 15, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We notice from the press dispatches that Congress may soon again be called on to pass appropriations for the distribution of garden seeds, etc.

May we, as citizens of the country, be permitted to express our disapproval of all these unnecessary expenditures and to respectfully suggest to you that you use your utmost influence against the passage of such bills. We know from our own experience and observation that the money spent for seeds is largely wasted, as the garden seed from the post office is a huge joke with many of us. Assuring you that we appreciate your efforts in your endeavor to eliminate all such expenses of the Government, we are,

Very respectfully,

L. E. Adrian, C. T. Beckham, Jas. Bright, J. K. P. Winn, A. Williamson, T. J. Williamson, H. W. Beckham, H. M. Scott, O. L. Dowdy, M. G. Scott, J. O. Walter, Mrs. Billings, R. B. Johnson, Joe Winter, W. E. Steadman, W. J. Armour, J. S. Reid, E. Kegans, Carl Edwards, Ross Campbell, L. Z. Petworth, C. Murdock, J. S. Campbell, Jackson Bright, Isaac Bright, C. Whitfield, J. M. Jones, A. J. English, R. R. Meets, Mrs. E. L. Mangum, Mrs. Jas. G. Waters, H. Kelso, R. B. McKee, C. C. McKee, C. L. McLeod, R. B. McKee, Jr., A. C. Terry, H. N. Smith.

The following was sent to me by Mr. M. W. Oldham, one of the leading farmers of Avoca, Tex.:

AVOCA, TEX., December 22, 1923.

Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: As farmers and voters we appeal to you as our Representative to oppose the garden seed bill. We understand that it is to come up before Congress again soon. We oppose any such law, because we consider it of no value whatever.

These seed that are sent out by the Government to all parts of the United States are of no benefit to us, because our climate and soil do not suit these seeds sent out.

We, as taxpayers, do not think it right to spend money for this, which is of no benefit to us.

We appeal to the United States Congress to oppose any such law or matter that comes before you.

We earnestly ask that this matter be considered seriously.

Yours truly,

M. W. OLDHAM.
N. B. OLDHAM.
J. H. EVETTS.
P. H. GIFFORD.
JOHN GIFFORD.
W. W. FARMER.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I could put in the Record a whole bunch more but that would take me another hour to read them, and I do not want to encumber the Record in that way. But I wanted you to know about these expressions from the people. If you get the pulse of your own constituents, if you could hear what they say about these free garden seeds when they take them from the post office, you would find that the great majority of the people of this country think that it is humbug practice that has well been stopped. I am glad that the Congress stopped it in the last session, and I hope that the Congress will not go back to it again. Let us give our constituents something else beside garden-seed service. You remember our former colleague, one of the most distinguished gentlemen in the House, the former gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Candler. You will all recall that he made so many speeches in favor of free garden seed that some of us got to calling him the garden-seed Congressman. Did the sending out of those garden seed keep him in Congress? Not at all. Neither will it keep any of you gentlemen in Congress. It is a liability instead of an asset. It makes the business men and the farmers of your community lose confidence

in the work that we should do here when we take up the time of our office to mail out a lot of 5-cent packages of garden seed, each one of which costs this Government more than 25 cents by the time they reach our particular constituents. It is a practice that should have been stopped long before Congress did stop it. It is a practice that I believe Congress will not again inaugurate.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirteen minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I want to say to the gentleman that I come from a district where there is no greater opportunity for trucking and farming and gardening afforded in any other part of the country, and the people there are absolutely disgusted with this free-seed distribution. Two-thirds of the seeds sent out by the former Congressman, before I came here, lay in the post offices and was eaten up by the rats. It cost a thousand dollars a day. I just wanted to indorse everything the gentleman from Texas said, but the gentleman did not want to give me an opportunity to do it.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say that the gentleman from California knows that I would not knowingly show him any discourtesy. I have the highest regard for him and we are good friends. I want to point him out to my colleagues as the kind of product that we in Texas raise—the very distinguished gentleman from California—as Texas sent him to California, and we are still proud of him.

Mr. LINEBERGER. No; I was born in Tennessee.

Mr. BLANTON. But we gave the gentleman a good education down there in Texas at a good Baptist college.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I am very proud of my sojourn in Texas, but I spent only two years in Texas, one in school. I thank the gentleman for the compliment, and I am sorry I do not merit all he says.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas use the balance of his time? We have only one speech over here?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I really feel like not using the time allotted to me. I intended to talk along the line which was so fully covered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Cooper]. However, I wish to add, if I may, just one or two suggestions to the most excellent speech which he made. We have here a most splendid city. It is a beautiful city to live in. It is the Nation's Capital, and I regret very much that there is so much violation of law here in the Nation's Capital. I regret very much that the newspapers speak so flippantly of the violation of law. I saw in a paper not long ago where some man who drove a high-powered car was pointed out by a prominent official as being one of the great bootleggers in the Nation's Capital. The newspapers carried an article about this bootlegger, as though it were a great honor to be a bootlegger here in the Nation's Capital.

We ought to enforce the law in Washington. We ought to enforce the prohibition laws. But that subject has been so fully covered that I want to talk just a little about the enforcement of the law against the autoists who speed here in the city of Washington. I believe our good friend Mr. BLANTON made a suggestion that there ought to be, possibly, a secret service corps of enforcement officers. That is true. If you get on a street car here at the Capitol and go out on the Mount Pleasant line I venture the assertion that you will see at least two or three men in that distance risking their lives by driving in front of the street car, forcing the man who drives that street car to slow down in order to save the life of the driver. The man who endangers his own life by driving in front of a speeding street car and forcing the motorman of that street car to slow down to save the life of the autoist will endanger by speeding your life and the lives of your wife and children.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. KING. I wonder if in the gentleman's investigation he has noticed the activity with which a man who drives a car seeks to run down those people who are crossing the white lines. I think it is a safer plan to keep out of the white lines rather than walk within the white lines. I understand also that Mr. Commissioner Oyster talks about removing the wooden platforms along the street-car tracks. Those are the last hope of the downtrodden pedestrian.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Does not the gentleman think the white lines help the people to see better?

Mr. LANKFORD. I can not say as to that. I notice that Mr. Oyster proposes to take off the speed limit as well as take away the wooden platforms. We need here an appropriation for officers dressed in plain clothes to go throughout the city and when they find a man violating the street ordinance arrest that man then and there and bring him into court and try him. Consider the low amount of the fines that are imposed here in the District of Columbia for violation of the speed law—\$1, \$2, or \$3. The ordinary man arrested for exceeding the speed limit is not fined enough. There ought to be a heavy fine put on the man who goes out and violates the law here, endangering the lives of men, women, and children. You pick up a newspaper in the morning and you see where a child is crushed by an automobile and is taken to the hospital, and then they wait to see if the child dies before they arrest the driver of the automobile that injured him, or the driver is let out on bail, and then an inquest is held and it is proven that the child walked in front of the automobile and the driver is released. Should the child have been crawling or running? It is a joke the way the speed ordinance is enforced here in the District of Columbia. The other day a poor woman was knocked down by an automobile in front of the House Office Building and dragged an entire square and since died.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. And the driver did not stop—

Mr. LANKFORD. No; the automobile did not stop. If the driver had been arrested, he would have probably been turned loose on his plea that the poor woman walked in front of the car. I do not suppose she flew there.

Officials in the District of Columbia who are charged with the enforcement of rules and regulations against speeding seem to accept as a good defense the fact that a child or a grown person walked in front of a speeding automobile and was hit. It is impossible to cross the street without walking in front of not one car only but dozens of cars. The fact that the man driving the car is doing so carelessly or at a high rate of speed and hits an individual either standing, walking, or running does not relieve the auto driver from full responsibility. The great trouble is that thousands of automobile drivers put the burden on other people to dodge them. They force the motorists of street cars to slow down in order to protect them. They force other drivers who are careful to slow down or change the course of their cars in order to protect them. These same careless, and in most cases extremely criminal, drivers also put the burden on the pedestrian to dodge and run for their lives.

Stand on one of our street corners for only a few minutes and watch and you will soon see drivers of automobiles hurrying along, turning corners, and looking not ahead but either back or in some direction other than where the car is going. They look enough to see that they are not driving their car into a tree, a brick wall, or a steam shovel, or some larger automobile, then they speed up their car, force the drivers of street cars to slow down to protect them. They force the drivers of smaller automobiles to dodge them and force pedestrians to run for their lives. If the pedestrian is hit he is accused of the awful crime of being on foot, walking on the street in front of the car at the time he was hit. This seems to make an absolute defense unless the newspapers report inaccurately the defenses which are sustained in cases where people are killed by automobiles driven at reckless speed or in a criminally negligent manner. It seems to make no difference how criminal the driver of the car is provided the party who was hit was walking in front of the car when he was hit, or got in front of the car by walking.

Under this same theory of defense, if a man takes a pistol and discharges it down a crowded street—it matters not how criminal his act may be—if he happened to hit some one who happened to walk where the bullet was going then he would not be guilty, for the wounded man walked in front of the pistol which was being discharged along a street in a crowded section of the city.

The effort to enforce rules and regulations in Washington against the automobile speed fiend is a farce and joke. I happened to be a witness some time ago in a case where an automobile driver criminally knocked the life out of a man, and in two or three minutes after the occurrence half a dozen or more negroes came up to where the negro driver who had knocked the life out of the man was held in the custody of a policeman and promptly told the policeman how carefully the driver of the automobile was proceeding and how negligently the man who was run over was walking. I knew that what

these witnesses told the policeman was absolutely false, and yet their names were furnished to the authorities, and the driver of the automobile was fully exonerated on their testimony.

The truth is the law is not being enforced. The driver who kills a man has disposed of a witness. He and his friends swear for him just what is necessary to clear him, and it is swallowed and believed and the criminal discharged harmless. I am positive that what happened in the case which came under my personal observation is happening every day. One thing which would relieve the situation very much would be the employment of a squad of plain-clothes men to go over the city and report violations and have those that violate traffic rules arrested and tried at once. It is a poor policy to wait until some one is severely injured, or killed before an arrest is made. It is still worse to make arrests when some one has been severely injured then make a joke of the whole situation by turning the criminal loose with a light fine or with no fine at all. We ought to have a squad of plain-clothes men patrolling the city and arresting violators of the speed and traffic regulations as fast as they occur without waiting for some one to be seriously injured. If this were done, there would be decidedly less violations of the law, scores of lives would be saved each year in Washington, hundreds of people who are injured would be saved harmless, and the streets of Washington would be at least reasonably safe for men, women, and children who themselves are observing the law. Drivers would be more careful, and I venture the assertion that the instance which I have just mentioned where the man was knocked lifeless at the intersection of Eighteenth and Mount Pleasant Streets would not have occurred if that driver had known that probably among the people passing this particular point there was a plain-clothes officer charged with the duty of making cases against people violating the traffic regulations of the city. It is my observation that the speed fiends and other autoist criminals here make at least a little effort to observe the rules in the presence of a uniformed official. What we need is a system whereby they may expect to be arrested at any moment regardless of whether there is a uniformed policeman in sight or not.

Mr. KUNZ. How many policemen did you find there where the accident you just mentioned occurred?

Mr. LANKFORD. A policeman finally came. I did not see any at first. I had to threaten using force to keep the driver from leaving before an officer came.

Mr. KUNZ. Is it not a fact that we have not enough policemen in this city?

Mr. LANKFORD. We probably have not, and we should have plain-clothes men to watch these cases and make arrests before serious harm is done by the criminal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for seven and one-half minutes.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, the discussion this morning has been very interesting, and I would like to have gotten into the discussion on the immigration proposition; but as my time is very limited, I merely want to call your attention to a letter which I have in my possession and which I feel the Members of this House ought to know about.

In doing this, it is necessary for me to give you a little history of bills which have been introduced in this House. On the 12th of January two identical bills were introduced in this House, one by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and one by myself, for the purpose of equalizing the compensation which was paid to young men who were in the training camps during the war. Certain young men sent me their claims from home, and I found that the young men who went in the first and second training camps received \$100 a month, but a bill was passed providing for pay to parties in training camps of \$100 per month up to June, 1918, and the department construed this act as only referring to men who had been assigned from line duty.

In discussing this matter with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] I found he had had the same trouble, and after taking up the matter with the Comptroller General we drew and introduced this bill for the relief of these soldiers.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have this short bill printed with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to print a bill which he has introduced in connection with his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill referred to is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5333) authorizing the payment of claims of men of the Army and Marine Corps while in training for commissions in the combatant branches of the Army and Marine Corps, and authorizing appropriation therefor.

Be it enacted, etc., That there are hereby authorized and directed to be paid the claims of all men of the Army and Marine Corps the difference between the pay received by them and pay at \$100 per month while in training in the training camps for commissions as officers in the combatant branches of the Army and Marine Corps for the actual period in training for such commissions during the period April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive, who have not been so paid; and payments shall be made to all such men, whether they entered training camps direct from civil life or were detached from duty with their organization. An appropriation is hereby authorized to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That all such claims shall be settled in the General Accounting Office and shall be held as finally determined, and shall never thereafter be reopened or considered, except upon review or reconsideration by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided further*, That no check or warrant issued in payment of such claims shall be delivered to any person other than the claimant or claimants, and the check or warrant shall be mailed to the claimant or claimants at their actual bona fide address or addresses, and no fee or fees shall be paid to any attorney, attorneys, or agents or for prosecution of such claims on account of such training service arising under this or any other act.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The thing to which I wish to call your attention especially is a letter which is being circulated from Indianapolis, Ind. The letter is headed in this way:

John P. Fitzgerald, Twelfth Company. Ralph Muszar, Fifteenth Company. Camp Gordon Veterans' League, organizing veterans of Central Officers' Training School, Indianapolis, Ind.

Mr. H. A. Griffith—

There is no date on this letter—

Dear Buddy—

A stranger—

Under an act of Congress of June 15, 1917, all men who attended officers' training school were entitled to pay at the rate of \$100 per month. However, this act did not carry any appropriation for such pay after June 30, 1918.

Now, as there were quite a few of us who were in training school after June 30, 1918, we should have received and are justly entitled to the same pay as the men who were in training school just a month or so before us; we were put to additional expense in the way of clothing, etc., and in all justice should be given the same pay as the men received who attended the earlier training schools.

It is our intention to have bills prepared and presented to both Senate and the House of Representatives asking that this matter be adjusted so that we may receive this additional pay.

From advice received by the party who had this letter sent to him I found that it was received by him on the 16th day of February, over a month after this bill had been prepared and introduced in the House and also introduced in the Senate by Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas.

In having these bills prepared and watching them through to a successful termination there will be certain expenses to be taken care of—necessary expenses—and we want you and all men who will be benefited by this legislation to help bear this necessary expense. We have made an estimate, and find that each man's pro rata share will be \$5.

Now, gentlemen, how far-reaching is that? A few days ago a representative of the War Department was in my office and discussed this bill, after it had been referred by the Military Committee to that department, and he informed me that there were 82,000 who would be the beneficiaries under this bill if it were passed. So they have figured it out on that basis, and they say it will require \$5 from each one of these men. You can see from this how large a fraud this is that they are undertaking to practice upon the soldiers.

As you are to receive benefits from the legislation and as the time to have these bills prepared and presented to Congress at this session is getting short, we ask that you join with us now; send in your share of this expense, so that we may get immediate action in this matter.

Mr. KELLER. To whom is the gentleman referring when he says "we"?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Fitzgerald and Muszar are the men who signed this letter, the men who wrote this letter, and it is signed that way, or, rather, Camp Gordon Veterans' League, by John P. Fitzgerald, secretary.

They state further that they will look after this matter after it is passed in seeing that each receives his share, when the

bill which has been introduced provides that no expense shall be attached to the collection of the money and that no attorney or agent shall receive anything out of any compensation which may be voted for these boys. It was our idea that whatever was voted in the interest of these young men should go to them as net, and we felt that the Members of Congress would be glad to render them assistance in seeing that their claims were collected. Further on they state:

Do not let this matter drag; time is short; you will receive benefits of approximately \$210 from this legislation.

That letter shows it is a fraud on its face, and it is an attempt, according to my idea, to get money under false pretenses and graft of the worst character, and I am further of the opinion they are guilty of using the mails for fraudulent purposes and attempting to rob the soldiers of this country who are the beneficiaries under this bill.

For what purposes do they want this money? I never heard of these people before. If they want it for the purpose of drafting bills, then let them be advised that it does not require money to have bills introduced in this House. If they want it to pay lobbyists, then let it be understood that no bill will pass this House when it is advocated by paid lobbyists. If it is for propaganda, then, as you know, we would all say, "God deliver us from any more propaganda, because we have had sufficient during this term of Congress."

I have called the attention of the Members of the House to this because I think it is a fraud and because I felt the Members of the House would be glad and would like to notify their boys at home not to give an organization of this kind any money under these circumstances. This is a just bill and should be passed, but, if passed at all, it will be passed alone upon its merits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I merely want to corroborate what has been said by my good friend and colleague from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS]. The bill he mentions would have been jointly introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee and myself but for the rules, which forbid an introduction jointly by Members, and we introduced the bills separately at the same time. The subject matter of this legislation was called to our attention not by any attorneys or by any lobbyists but by reason of the fact that some of our own constituents wrote us with reference to compensation due them in attending training camps. In one instance an ex-service man who wrote me and who was entitled to receive compensation under a ruling of the department sent a letter of some attorney who had written him asking that he place his claim with him for collection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. This is the reason that in drafting the bill the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] and I incorporated the provision that no attorneys' fees should be paid for those who handle these claims. It was to protect the soldiers against this species of graft, and I resent, in the same forceful language that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] does, the implication that it is necessary for ex-service men to pay money to anybody to get legislation passed through this Congress in their behalf. [Applause.]

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the purpose of any remarks I have to make to-day is to call attention to a condition in traffic which I think this Congress is as much to blame for as anybody else, and I believe it is only negligence that it is here. A good deal of criticism comes from time to time about reckless driving in the city of Washington. Perhaps there is some reckless driving, and there may be much of it, but there is another angle to safety in travel in a city, particularly in the congested parts and during the congested time of the day, which I think is just as important to the welfare and safety of the public as to be a careful driver, and that is to be a careful walker across the street. In the city of Washington I believe the pedestrian in crossing the street is more reckless than in any other city of the United States. Many times you will drive along the street where there is no street crossing in sight, even at dusk when it is not very light, and somebody will step out from behind a car and

start diagonally across the street. The individual who jeopardizes his life ought to have no comeback in law if the driver of the vehicle that injures him has been driving in such a way as to have his car under control at all times. Every driver of an automobile expects an obstruction to come in the way at the street crossings, and in between the street crossings he has a right to expect a clear way; and, in fact, beyond that, I believe that he ought to be given a clear way in order to clear traffic off the streets. The problem of traffic to-day is one of the big problems in every city, and the only criticism I can make along that line in this city is that traffic is held on the streets a half longer than it ought to be to clear the way. Now, what could be remedied and what could be done to make it possible to get an automobile off of the street? I am sure that 90 per cent of the people in automobiles are going to some definite point.

There may be 10 per cent joy riding around. To do anything to clear off the streets for the joy rider would not help at all, but for the business man and the man who is going in a machine to some definite point, the quicker he can get there the quicker he gets off of one street and onto another, and your traffic is less congested. Then what could be done, and this is the part that Congress will be held responsible for, in my judgment? If you get in your automobile this afternoon and start down any street in the city where there are traffic officers—and let me just digress enough to say that I believe the traffic officers in the city of Washington are on a par with those in any city in the United States, and it is very, very seldom in my experience that I have ever encountered even a discourteous one. They are usually tolerant and courteous. Once in a while, as will happen in all crowds of people, you will find a man who is an exception, but if you start down the street this afternoon and the traffic officer stops you, we will say, at Sixth Street, and you are going down Pennsylvania Avenue, you will stay there until the traffic going across Pennsylvania Avenue is through, and then he will turn the sign and let you through, and just about the time you get your car started well up goes the block on Seventh Street, and it continues that way all the way down the Avenue. You can not blame the traffic officers for that, because there is no way to-day whereby the traffic cop on Sixth Street can tell what the traffic officers on Seventh Street and Ninth Street and Eleventh Street and Thirteenth Street are going to do. So what is the solution? The only solution is for this Congress to appropriate enough money so that on the main thoroughfares you can have it like it is in New York and Philadelphia on the main thoroughfares, a semaphore system which gives you the right of way to drive for three or four or five minutes and then drive at a speed that will get you off of the street. There is not any reason, there is not any sense, in an 8 or 10 mile an hour speed limit in traffic other than the fact that you have not got your problem solved so that you can get rid of your traffic.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes. Mr. BEGG. Take the situation at Seventeenth and Pennsylvania Avenue, when a great crowd of automobiles on Seventeenth Street start to go across and they are flagged and are turned up on Pennsylvania Avenue to go across and turn around and get on the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue and come back to Seventeenth Street and then go down the street. That kind of an arrangement only increases the congestion of traffic, and it is not to the best interests of getting traffic off of the streets. I am not offering this as a criticism of the traffic officers. I am offering it as one of the problems of the traffic situation in Washington, and I believe that part of the burden of responsibility rests on us for not appropriating the amount of money necessary to furnish the equipment, so they can lay the city out with direct traffic streets, so that when they give you the right of way you can expect to drive 10 blocks and not have somebody switch in on a side street and run into you. I believe that if such an arrangement was worked out traffic accidents in the city of Washington could be reduced by at least 50 per cent.

Just as a clincher to what I have tried to tell you, I will recite my experience last summer. In coming back to Washington I came by New York and Philadelphia. I had never driven an automobile in New York City, and I would rather drive down Broadway or Fifth Avenue this afternoon in my automobile with my family and would feel more secure than I would to take it at 5 o'clock and start to go from here to my apartment or to my home out in the northwest. Why? Simply because I know that when the semaphore flashes the signal to go I am going to be permitted to go, and there is no one to come in from a side street and wreck me broadside.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will take the 10 minutes I yielded to myself and endeavor to say something about the bill before the committee. I will state that the bill as originally introduced has the approval of the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Director of the Budget. The members of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee which considered this bill made a number of changes. We have endeavored in the increase granted to confine our recommendations within reasonable limits and bounds. The aggregate increases carried in the bill approximate about 10 per cent. We have granted to the policemen of the District the following increases: Privates of the first class, an increase of from \$1,700 to \$1,800; to privates of the second class, from \$1,800 to \$1,900; to privates of the third class, from \$1,900 to \$2,100; sergeants, from \$2,040 to \$2,400; lieutenants, from \$2,240 to \$2,700; lieutenant detectives, \$2,640 to \$3,000; captains, \$2,640 to \$3,000; inspectors, \$2,640 to \$3,250; assistant superintendent, \$3,000 to \$3,500; and to the major and superintendent, \$4,500 to \$5,200.

In the fire department we propose an increase for private, class 1, from \$1,700 to \$1,800; class 2, \$1,800 to \$1,900; class 3, \$1,900 to \$2,100; marine fireman, \$1,700 to \$1,800; marine engineer's assistant, \$1,900 to \$2,150; marine engineer, \$1,940 to \$2,250; pilot, \$1,940 to \$2,250; assistant superintendent of machinery, \$2,240 to \$2,500; superintendent of machinery, \$2,740 to \$3,250; sergeant, \$1,940 to \$2,200; captain, \$2,140 to \$2,500; inspector, \$1,900 to \$2,000; deputy fire marshal, \$2,240 to \$2,500; fire marshal, \$2,640 to \$3,250; deputy chief engineer, \$3,000 to \$3,500; and the chief engineer, \$4,000 to \$5,200.

The total increase of the police department is \$197,460. The total pay roll under the present law is \$1,873,440. The total pay roll as provided in this bill is \$2,072,900.

The fire department is increased from \$1,319,040 to a total pay roll as carried in this bill of \$1,466,200.

The total increase carried in the bill for the fire department is \$147,160. The bill also provides that the members of the police department and the fire department shall be allowed one day of rest in seven. This will necessitate 139 additional privates in the police department and will necessitate, assuming such a number is immediately appointed, an appropriation of \$250,000.

In the fire department one day of rest in seven will require 105 additional men and an expenditure of \$189,000. So the total increase in the two departments as carried in this bill amounts to \$344,620 in the way of increase.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. The bill carries a proposed increased salary for the police.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. What per cent?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. About 10 per cent, but less than that for privates.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Does it contemplate that we will have more efficient service with reference to pedestrians than we now have? Does the gentleman happen to know the intention of the police force?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The members of the police department and the members of the fire department have assured the committee that they expect to render the highest possible service. I will say that we have one of the most efficient police forces in the country, and I can say the same of the fire department.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I noticed one day last week that the driver of an automobile struck a negro woman about the office building and dragged her all the way across that square and he escaped and he never was caught by the police department. On the same day a white woman was killed down near Seventh Street. What excuse can the police authorities give for that?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that the Capitol grounds are not under the supervision of the Metropolitan police force.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. This was not on the Capitol grounds, this was on B Street. The newspaper account of it was that the woman was struck and dragged all the way across the block to Brown's café. Does the gentleman from Maryland think that is efficient service?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say that as a matter of record during the past year the police department of the city of Washington had a 100 per cent record in the apprehension of criminals.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Does the gentleman remember how many assaults upon women and how many of the parties

were caught in the city of Washington? If that is efficiency, I should like to know it.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I have not the figures, but they have been put in the record several times by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I must say that the gentleman's figures are not very reliable if reports are correct. Now, I am in favor of paying policemen well. However, I happen to have lived in several different small cities, ranging from 10,000 to 50,000 inhabitants. The gentleman speaks of the efficiency of the police force of this city. I think there is less efficiency here in the police force when it comes to protection of women upon whom assaults are made, and protection of pedestrians who would like to walk the streets feeling a measure of safety, than in any other city I have ever been in, and the streets here are very much wider than they are in other cities.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Is the gentleman familiar with the statistics in other cities? Does he not know that there has been an epidemic of crime in the great cities. I think the gentleman will find the record of this city compares more than favorably with that of the others.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think that the daily casualties in the city of Washington are about twice as heavy as they have been in other cities in the last few years, when it comes to automobile accidents?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. It is true they have been greater than those of some other cities, but not twice.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. What is the explanation of that, when the streets here are almost twice as wide as they are in other cities?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Oh, that is a very long story, and I would not have time to go into it now.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think that makes a record for efficiency?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I think the police department has done as well as it could under the existing laws and the crowded conditions of the local courts, and the releasing of many men on small collateral.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Does the organic law fix the number of officers and privates on the police force?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Not to my knowledge. It is my understanding that the number of the police force was fixed by law of Congress passed in 1919.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. How many were permitted?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I can not tell the gentleman right now.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. In section 2 of the bill there is a provision for the authorization of 35 lieutenant detectives.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. That is existing law.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The amendment strikes that out, so that the bill as presented with the committee amendments does not increase the number of officers or the number of privates. The gentleman's report indicates that since one day in seven is to be given, the number of privates will have to be increased.

I am asking the question only to be sure that the bill accomplishes just what the gentleman desires. Did the gentleman understand that this bill creates additional officers or men?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. It is not my idea that this bill in general terms by direction changes the existing number of policemen, but it is my opinion that if Congress should pass this bill in its present form and these men were to be given by direction of law one day's rest in seven, and Congress wants to keep the same number of men on police duty and fire duty throughout the 24 hours that they now have, it would be necessary to increase the number of firemen and policemen by one-seventh.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. This bill creates a necessity for an additional number of men and as I understand the gentleman the bill itself does not provide for them. The bill as originally drawn did make provision for additional ones.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No; the gentleman is mistaken, the 35 detectives constitute the number now on the force under existing law.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit me, the police and fire departments in the District of Columbia were the only two departments paid by the Government who were not granted a day off in lieu of Sunday out of every seven. The committee in considering that matter thought it was just to the policemen and firemen to accord to them what has been accorded every other employee of this Government, and they provided for that in this bill.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I am not talking about that at all.

Mr. BLANTON. There is where the additional men come in. That is the only provision of the bill that requires additional men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. All time has expired and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Metropolitan police force shall be as follows: Major and superintendent, \$5,200; assistant superintendents, \$3,500 each; inspector in charge of detective headquarters, \$3,730; inspectors, \$3,250 each; lieutenant assistant to inspector in charge of detective headquarters, \$2,980; captains, \$2,800 each; lieutenant detectives, \$2,600 each; lieutenants, \$2,500 each; sergeants, \$2,200 each; privates of class 3, \$2,100 each; privates of class 2, \$1,900 each; privates of class 1, \$1,600 each. Driver-privates shall have the same rank and pay as privates of the above classes. Members of said police force who may be mounted on horses, furnished and maintained by themselves, shall each receive an extra compensation of \$450 per annum; members of said force who may be mounted on motor vehicles, furnished and maintained by themselves, shall each receive an extra compensation of \$480 per annum; members of said force who may be mounted on bicycles shall each receive an extra compensation of \$70 per annum; members of said force detailed for special service in the various precincts in the prevention and detection of crime shall each receive an extra compensation of \$180 per annum; and members detailed to the motorcycle service shall each receive an extra compensation of \$120 per annum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that unless there is a different order it would be necessary probably to report each amendment separately.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be reported and voted upon en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "each," strike out the words "inspector in charge of detective headquarters, \$3,730."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "each," strike out the semicolon and the words "lieutenant assistant to inspector in charge of detective headquarters, \$2,980," and insert a colon and the words: "Provided, That the inspector assigned to the supervision and command of the detective bureau shall during the period of such assignment be rated as and shall receive the pay of an assistant superintendent."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "\$2,800" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the words "lieutenant detectives, \$2,600 each"; and in the same line strike out the figures "\$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,700"; and after the word "each," in line 6, page 2, insert a colon and the words: "Provided, That the lieutenant assigned as assistant to the inspector commanding the detective bureau shall during the period of such assignment hold the rank and receive the pay of a captain."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "\$2,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,400."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "\$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,100."

Page 2, line 15, strike out the words "mounted on" and insert "called upon to use"; and in line 18, after the word "annum," insert "members of said force detailed to detective headquarters in the prevention and detection of crime shall each receive extra compensation of \$600 per annum."

Page 2, line 25, strike out "\$180" and insert "\$240."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I desire recognition, Mr. Chairman, in opposition to the committee amendment; but let my friend from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] go ahead first.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I desire to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if I understand the purpose of this amendment it is to increase the salary of the members of the police force and other officials of the city who are now serving and is not to increase the number of the force. As I understand, some of these increases range a little above 10 per cent. So far as I am personally concerned, I would be glad of an opportunity to reduce expenses rather than increase them. Yesterday we were engaged in the consideration of legislation for the reduction of taxation. Of course, we can not reduce taxes if, after voting tax reduction one day, we engage next day in raising salaries. If we pursue such policy, it will be only a question of time when we shall have to increase taxes again. If we could in-

crease the efficiency of the service by an increase of compensation, and I could be assured of that fact, I might be willing to vote for the proposed increase.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the only motive that prompts me to support these increases—the assurance given by the police department and the fire department that if we grant them these increases they can weed out from their force inefficient men, men not qualified, and get the highest-class men available, and that they will give us a model service, the best in the United States. Usually I am not in favor of any kind of increases, but I am in favor of an increase for these men who risk their lives daily. There is hardly a day passes but that when they leave home they do not know that they will ever get back alive to their wives and children. If they assure us that they will give us good service, I believe in giving them an increase.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. If I were a policeman, I might believe my life endangered if I undertook to walk around the streets of this city, especially just at a time when some one else might desire to cross the street in an automobile. I think their lives are endangered often in this way when they walk the streets. But the trouble is that their lives are not endangered in many instances by trying to protect the lives of people of the city. I fear they do not always make an honest effort to protect the citizens.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman is doing a little injustice to the police force in saying that. There are some high-class men on this police force. Of course, they have some others, but the main body of them are men of the highest character.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I want a guaranty from them before I vote an increase. I want to know whether they will get rid of those who have not been discharging their duties. Last year, if I have the figures correct, this city was the second among all the cities of the United States, regardless of population, for casualties caused by automobile accidents. Is that correct?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I understood there were about 60 automobile accidents.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I think it was 85 persons killed here, and year before last it was 97. Last year, I believe, the city of Los Angeles, Calif., was the only city in the United States where the death rate from automobile accidents was as high as that in Washington. Yet here is a city with streets 300 feet wide—no reason for hurting pedestrians—and yet a man must oftentimes risk his life to cross the street.

Mr. ALLGOOD. There have been, as I understand, more than 8,000 violations of the traffic regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. ALLGOOD. There were over 8,000 violations. I wonder if the gentleman does not think that the courts are somewhat to blame. It looks as if the policemen were arresting violators all right, but the courts must be to blame for not enforcing fines on those violators. There were 8,000 violations of the law in a year.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I do not know just where the trouble is, but I presume there must be some fault with the policemen themselves. When 97 people are killed in one year in this city and about 90 in another by automobiles, it becomes a startling situation. When a man can not safely cross a street 300 feet wide in the Capital of the Nation something is wrong.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. For a brief question.

Mr. BEGG. Does not the gentleman think that the man crossing the street is more responsible than the driver of the automobile? Is not the important thing the requirement that the man shall cross at the crossing and not between blocks?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Does the gentleman know of anybody that was killed who was not killed on the crossing?

Mr. BEGG. I venture the assertion that most of the accidents occurred at places other than on the crossings.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Give the facts. I do not want the gentleman to "venture the assertion." Give the facts. Name them.

Mr. BEGG. I saw one accident myself up on Florida avenue and Fourteenth street. The man was not killed, but was hurt by an automobile.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Was he walking across the street at the crossing?

Mr. BEGG. No; he was walking across at some other place than the crossing. I think the gentleman will find that in other cities people walk across the street at the crossings, while here never.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Pedestrians usually cross at the proper places. Does the gentleman drive a car?

Mr. BEGG. Yes; I have driven a car, and I never have hit anybody, but we may do it at any time.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Maybe that affects the gentleman's judgment. I have to dodge for my life almost onto the sidewalk.

Mr. BEGG. Not if the gentleman will observe the traffic cop's orders and walk within the marked lines.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. The gentleman should know that is seldom the case. One woman was killed over here near the Capitol this week. Almost every time a Member of Congress crosses the white lines between the House Office Building and the Capitol he takes his life in his own hands. He usually runs great risk.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And the gentleman knows, if he drives a car, that he has to watch out for the reckless driver. That is where the danger lies.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes; that is exactly the situation.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And bearing on the case of the old charwoman who was killed right on the crossing two or three days ago, if the party who was driving that automobile had been held up by a policeman that poor, old charwoman would not have lost her life; and yet she was where she had a right to be.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes. And the press said not only that but that she was dragged a whole block and that the guilty party, having killed the poor, old negress, escaped. Not a policeman in the whole city of Washington to arrest him, yet he had miles to go to get out of the city. On the same day another old lady, 50 years old, was killed at another place by an automobile, and to show our gratitude we are asked to raise the salaries of the police force.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Has my friend ever investigated to find out how many police officers there are in this city in comparison with other cities? I think that is a matter which should be investigated. In Detroit some time ago they had the same sort of a situation which is complained of here, and what they did there was to increase the number of policemen and organize an efficient traffic squad. One difficulty here has been a shortage of men.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I have never yet seen any department in Washington City that did not have plenty of employees. I think the great trouble is that they have too many, but I am not sure how many they have on the police force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I have just one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. In addition to those who were killed, there were quite a number of casualties which did not prove fatal.

For just a minute I want to speak in behalf of the women of this city. The great number of assaults that were made upon women in this city last year is enough to make the blood of every American citizen boil. To think that a negro, or a white man, either, can come here under the Dome of the Capitol and outrage the women of this land, and never arrested or punished, is a disgrace to the Nation. Gentlemen, that is a serious matter, and, so far as I am concerned, I want more than assurances when you talk about raising the salaries of our police force. I want a guaranty that the life and virtue of women at the Capital will be safe and sacred. That is a condition which does not exist now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Before the gentleman from Indiana proceeds, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would not ask that. The gentlemen have some things on their system which they want to get off, and I think we should let them do it. I would not try to limit them, and you will get along faster by it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the time be divided equally between those who favor the bill and those who oppose it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will try to so divide it.

Mr. STENGLE. I hope the Chair will. Some of us would like to speak in favor of the bill and not hear from all those who oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, whom does the Chair recognize?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I sought to find out from the members of the committee in general debate whether or not there is any limitation in the organic law as to the number of officers and privates on the police force. I do not know, because I have not examined it. If there is not, I think this bill, as they propose to amend it, is in order; but if there is a limitation, the bill does not accomplish anything, because it does not increase the number, although it proposes a law which creates a necessity for a great increase.

Mr. BLANTON. They have been increasing them as fast as the Congress, through the Appropriations Committee would give them the money. Therefore, I take it, the organic law makes no restriction, because the police force has been increased from time to time whenever the Appropriations Committee would grant the estimate made by the commissioners.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I thank my friend from Texas. In 1917 there was this provision in the appropriation bill:

And the provision in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913, which provides: "After June 30, 1912, there shall be no appointments except by promotion," etc., "until the whole number of privates in all of said classes shall have been reduced to 640."

In 1913 there seems to have been a limitation placed on the appropriation bill which was in the nature of general law and was the same as if it were the organic law making the number of privates 640, and that seems to have been repealed by the appropriation act of 1917. I do not know whether there has been any change or not.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say to the gentleman that we had the inspector of the police department and of the fire department go over this bill, and the provisions of it were approved by them.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. And the amendments.

Mr. BLANTON. The various paragraphs of the bill and the amendments of the committee.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes. The second section provides for additional officers and additional men, and that is stricken out by the committee amendment, so there is nothing in the bill except to raise the salaries of the different officers and of the different men and to provide that they shall have a rest one day in seven.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will state to the gentleman that the language stricken out in section 2 is existing law. Thirty-five is the number of lieutenant detectives now.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That may be the number that is appropriated for and that is exactly what I am trying to find out. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is accurate when he says there is no limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think so. It is dependent on the appropriation Congress gives them.

Mr. HAMMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HAMMER. I simply wanted to say to the gentleman that there clearly would have to be more policemen appointed, because the provision providing for one day of rest in seven will necessarily require that and there will have to be an appropriation by Congress in a deficiency bill.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. There is no doubt about that, and we can provide for it when we come to the matter of appropriations. The thing I was driving at was whether you had any law to provide for your additional 139, and if there is no limitation you do not need any provision, but I notice the report says that for the police department the one-day rest in seven provision will require 139 additional privates of class I.

I am going to support this measure, Mr. Chairman, not because I have studied it carefully and know whether this is a just rate to be paid or not but because I am going to trust the District Committee, but this is a very great increase in pay.

It is substantially 10 per cent to the men themselves, and one day in seven means 14 per cent, which makes substantially a 25 per cent increase in the cost to the Government of paying these police officers. I take it the gentlemen who have reported this measure have investigated the question of the rest of one day in seven to police officers in other jurisdictions, and that this is a just measure, but I was rather surprised to find out that in this one measure there is practically a 25 per cent increase in the cost of the police force.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. Some of us think it is not high enough, as the bill stands now, compared with other cities, so that it is not the maximum, in my judgment, that ought to have been provided.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I think we should pay these police officers well, and I think the police officers in the city of Washington, in a general way, measure up to the high standard of the police officers of this country. They have their difficulties, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLER. This is a compromise salary bill.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Michigan a question?

Mr. McKEOWN and Mr. STENGLE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Virginia opposed to the bill?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. McKEOWN. Gentlemen, I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that the police ought to be well paid; but, on the other hand, I am reminded when it comes to increasing salaries in this Congress of the great petition of the farmers of the United States brought here by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in which the farmers asked that there be no more increases in salaries and that there be no more increases in the number of officers. It does seem to me that this could have gone on for at least another year, until the country has somewhat recovered, before we bring such an increase in here. I would be inclined to follow the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], because he is a very safe and sound man to follow on the question of economy, but I do not think at this time you ought to bring increases in here. You have talked about the police force. It is a very dangerous business and is very dangerous work. I do not think the trouble in Washington is so much from the police force; I think the trouble comes from the fact that you do not have sufficient penalties to penalize and punish these people who have no regard for human life. There ought to be a statute in this city that any man who shows an abandoned disposition touching the matter of human life ought to be a felon and go to the penitentiary, and whenever you put some of these birds in the penitentiary you are going to have safer driving in Washington, and you are not going to have it until then. You talk about your policemen; the engineer who pulls a passenger train at midnight through the country has on every hand signals of danger. He has lights all along the way he goes to show him the danger, but the policeman going down through a back alley in the darkness of the night has nothing to show him the danger of the assassin or the burglar or the bootlegger; and, by the way, the bootlegger has become one of the most dangerous criminals in the country to-day. He has become an abandoned criminal. He cares not for human life and he is a dangerous element which the police have to deal with; but aside from that, gentlemen, what ought we to do in the city of Washington? What ought the Congress of the United States to do?

In my humble judgment, the Congress of the United States ought to give to the city of Washington a Territorial form of government at the earliest possible moment. They ought to have a Territorial form of government and the Congress of the United States ought to set aside the amount of money that goes to the city of Washington, and that ought to be all required of the Appropriations Committee. Then let the District of Columbia have a legislature, say, of 24 members in the house and 12 senators; let there be a governor appointed by the President of the United States; give them a Delegate in the House, and let the legislature levy its taxes and let it appropriate the money which Congress appropriates in bulk to them; and let them have their own government and not take up the time of the Congress here when we ought to be engaged in business for all the great cities of the country. The District gets one-thirteenth of the time of the United States Congress, and yet it constitutes only one two-hundred-and-fifteenth part of the population of the United States. Gentlemen, this is serious.

The District gets two days out of every month. The men on the Committee on the District of Columbia are the hardest-worked Members of the Congress, outside, probably, of the Committee on Appropriations. They have to wrestle with these matters that should be settled here in the District by the people themselves. The Congress ought to get rid of this unnecessary burden. It ought to reserve the right to disapprove any act that the legislature of the District of Columbia passed any time within two years. The statutes would be in force unless it is disapproved by such act of Congress. I think the time is here now when the Congress of the United States ought to act on this question. We have some of the best Members of this House whose time is taken up on matters of the District of Columbia, whose talents ought to be engaged in the great questions that are confronting the whole people; and I say to you that the personnel of that committee is as good as any committee we have in the House. They are now wrestling with the rent question here in the District of Columbia. I say that if you will turn these people over to a territorial form of government, give them a governor and a legislature and let them solve their own difficulties, they will be better solved and you will have less trouble.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of engaging in any heated discussion on this subject, but I felt after hearing some remarks made on the bill that it probably would not be amiss if I made a few observations. Let me say in the beginning that during the past six years I have actively participated in the making of more than 25,000 policemen in the largest city in this country. During that same period I have had to do with the promotion from grade to grade of the entire force, numbering 12,000 men. It is all right to talk about giving the vote to the District of Columbia, if that is the subject before us, but if I understand this bill it is merely and purely a question of giving to the policemen and firemen in this city a reasonable compensation upon which to exist while they undertake to perform their public duty.

I am sometimes amazed at the wonderful economy displayed by my colleagues who will argue here for two hours or more that we are giving these poor fellows too much money when only two weeks ago without ever looking into the details they were voting daily 50, 80, and 90 per cent increases for the supervisory officials in the Departments of the Interior, the Treasury, and the Post Office. If you want to be economists why not cut down the salaries of such men as those instead of taking from these men the measly salaries they draw in trying to get an honest and decent livelihood?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENGLE. I will yield gladly.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman think the gentleman from Indiana can charge up against the police and firemen's increase their day off in lieu of Sunday which everybody has?

Mr. STENGLE. He should not unless he charges for the day and a half of employees of the city and the Government and make that a part of the increase in the salary that we are proclaiming we are going to give them. It is customary, gentlemen, to give every man his day off for rest. It is nothing unusual to see a man in public service, with the exception of Members of Congress, have his day off for rest. We never get it here. But these men are entitled to it. The fact that a man gets run down on a public highway is an incident and not an argument in favor of or against the increase of salary for patrolmen who happen per se to be standing on the crossing. The whole question before us, as I understand it, is just this: Are we giving them too much, or are we giving them too little? I say to you, based on an experience that is greater than any of those I have heard here on the floor, that \$2,100 as a maximum for a patrolman in this District is entirely too small, as compared with \$1,200 in the smaller cities. We give \$2,500 in the city of New York, and give them time off and we do not cry about it.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENGLE. Gladly.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I have here a table showing the average pay of patrolmen in 98 cities in the United States, and the average is \$2,376.

Mr. STENGLE. We pay the street cleaners more in New York City than you pay your patrolmen in the city of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired, and the question is on the committee amendments to section 1.

The question was taken, and the committee amendments to section 1 were agreed to.

Mr. KUNZ. Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman can not make that motion in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, is not that the same as moving to strike out the enacting clause?

Mr. KUNZ. I do not care to move to strike out the enacting clause. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill, while I am not opposing it, I believe in raising the salaries of these men who are on the police force in Washington. But so far as the citizens of Washington are concerned, it gives to them no protection. This bill does not increase the number of men; it simply increases the salaries. What we need in Washington is more protection with uniformed policemen. When you drive along the streets of Washington, you know very well that you are liable to find somebody coming along at a rate of 30 or 40 miles an hour, and unless you are very careful you are going to have some one run into you. If we had policemen enough to protect the people of Washington, you would have them in uniform and they would be a prevention of crime; they would prevent accidents. It is too late after some one has been injured.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is reminded that the time for debate was limited and exhausted.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may finish his five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNZ. The trouble is that while this is District of Columbia day, Members have had so much poison injected into their systems with other matters that their minds are not in position to properly discuss this subject. We have men on the District Committee who come and talk about economy, never taking into consideration the fact that conditions are different here, that requirements are different. They are reading into the Record letters and telegrams in order to apprise their constituents of how busy they are in economizing for the great Government of the United States. We have men who have come here and know nothing about city life—they come from the State of Texas, and might make good farmers, might make good country lawyers, but so far as running a city like Washington they have not the remotest idea of it. I want to call attention to the fact that in this bill an increase has been made to these men, and I believe justly so. The man who rides a horse has his salary decreased because some gentleman wants to economize and show to the people of his district that he was here and objected to the people of this country paying to support Washington and Washingtonians. What we need is more money for protection. If this Congress would appropriate more money for more men, you would have better protection and you would have less accidents on the streets in the city of Washington.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNZ. Yes.

Mr. STENGLE. I notice the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is here. Will the gentleman kindly address those remarks to him?

Mr. KUNZ. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who formerly served in the city council of the city of Chicago, well knows the condition of Washington, far better than a number of men who are now here trying to economize, and I know that the gentleman who presides as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is willing to do for Washington what he did for Chicago when he was chairman of the finance committee of the common council of that city. He understands the condition, and, as I said before, you have men who are penny-wise and pound-foolish, who are all the time objecting to and opposing appropriations which ought to be made in the interest of this great city. If these gentlemen will only take more interest and save more time by less talk, filling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there would be a greater saving and more good done for the people of the country. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. In addition to the officers now authorized by law, the Metropolitan police force shall consist of 35 lieutenant detectives, to be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in lieu of the 35 privates now authorized to be detailed to detective headquarters for special service in the detection and prevention of crime. Any of the privates so detailed at the time this act takes effect may be so appointed without examination.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 2.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the committee amendment. Our colleague from Illinois [Mr. Kunz] has taken a most ridiculous position upon the floor of the House. When there was nothing before the committee except to begin reading another part of the bill; when the committee had agreed upon the former section and was ready to do something else, he took up five minutes of our time in an attempt to give this committee a lecture about wasting the time of the committee in windbagging and about how little some people knew about things. I want him to read over his remarks in the morning when they appear in the RECORD if he lets them go in, and he will see just how much enlightenment he gave us. I noticed that he mentioned the State of Texas. I hail from that great State; and in connection with that he spoke in derision of the economy of reducing the extra allowance for a policeman who kept a horse to \$450. The idea of such a thing! Some men could get rich stabling horses at \$450 each. The gentleman from Illinois has thoroughbred horses. He imagines that it costs a policeman as much to barn a police horse here as it does him to take care of those fine horses of his in Chicago.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois is not particularly friendly to the great State of Texas on account of the fact that a gentleman from that State—I think from the gentleman's own district—broke up the sale of gold bricks in the city of Chicago, and there were three citizens less in that city after he left there.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and that is what is probably disturbing his equanimity. My colleague refers to the incident when a horseman from west Texas went to Chicago and they tried to sell him the usual gold brick. But at the same time he handed them his \$5,000 he picked up the real brick of gold and would not let them take it off to wrap it up and thus make the exchange for something worthless, and when they assaulted him there were three less gold-brick sellers in Chicago; and a Chicago jury cleared the Texan of wrongdoing.

Mr. HUDSPETH. He still remembers that incident?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. Show me a man who knows anything much about horses and about maintaining them who would claim that a man should be allowed more than \$450 a year for maintaining one. That is what the committee cuts that down to. A larger amount was expected of your committee, and we thought that \$450 was sufficient to maintain a policeman's horse.

If you will confer with your constituents who keep horses, even in livery stables, you will find that it can be done within that sum. There is nothing picayune about it, nor extravagant. We allowed what we thought was a fair allowance for maintaining a horse in the District, and I want to say to the gentleman that all of these policemen who are mounted have barns on their premises in the outskirts of the city where they keep their horses.

Mr. KUNZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; certainly I yield to my friend from Chicago.

Mr. KUNZ. Is it not a fact that the committee reduced the keep of a horse under what was allowed last year?

Mr. BLANTON. I think they were allowed \$480 last year. They asked \$540, and we reduced it to \$450.

Mr. KUNZ. So that the policeman gets \$30 less this year than last?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. The committee thought \$450 was enough to keep a horse.

Mr. KUNZ. But feed is not any cheaper than it was last year.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, but we paid them too much last year; these policemen do not feed their horses as the gentleman from Chicago does his thoroughbreds, and when they ship one of them they do not ride in palace cars, as do the horses of the gentleman from Illinois, and they do not have a special man in care of them, as do the horses of the gentleman from Illinois. And they are not specially blanketed as his are. The gentleman has an idea about only one specific thing, and the committee has general ideas about a whole combination of things. The committee is looking at the matter from the standpoint of the interest of the American people and not from the viewpoint of thoroughbred-horse fanciers in Chicago. I hope the distinguished gentleman will study up on this question before he again endeavors to lecture the members of the committee who worked hard on this bill.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia shall be as follows: Chief engineer, \$5,200; deputy chief engineers, \$3,500 each; battalion chief engineers, \$3,050 each; fire marshal, \$3,250; deputy fire marshal, \$2,500; inspectors, \$2,000 each; captains, \$2,500 each; lieutenants, \$2,350 each; sergeants, \$2,200 each; superintendent of machinery, \$3,250; assistant superintendent of machinery, \$2,500; pilots, \$2,250 each; marine engineers, \$2,250 each; assistant marine engineers, \$2,150 each; marine firemen, \$1,800 each; privates of class 3, \$2,000 each; privates of class 2, \$1,900 each; privates of class 1, \$1,800 each.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 11, strike out the figure "3" and insert the figure "2."

Page 3, line 21, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$2,100."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McSWEENEY rose.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kunz] has spoken about extravagance in expenditures. I am greatly in favor of tax reduction and of reducing all of the expenditures of Government, but I do believe a sharp distinction must be drawn as between expenditures which are foolish and those that might be classed as good, sound investments. I feel there are no men in civil life who so jeopardize themselves as the firemen and policemen of a community. As a member of my own local volunteer fire department, I realize as my community grows that there are added difficulties for these men. I feel it to be a real investment to do something to provide better men, better equipment, and to let them have a standard of living that every other group has. We all realize that the basis of pay has been generally fixed according to the hazard of the work in which men are engaged.

You realize that back in the old days, when James B. Eads built the bridge across the Mississippi River, the men who were engaged in that work were allowed \$6 or \$8 per hour because they were subjected to great danger and difficulty. That was back in the old days when the present modern high wages were unknown. Now, we know that the man in the police department or in the fire department is subjected to difficulties, and yet he receives a relatively low rate of wages. Nowadays the firemen have to protect higher buildings and larger structures, and the larger the structures are the greater the danger. These men in the fire department and in the police department who are now asking for an increase of wages are the ones that should be considered. The policemen, as the city of Washington grows, have increased difficulties and increased labor to perform. Traffic is increasing, and these men have to watch over the safety of the citizens.

We realize that with every law that is passed to protect the citizens greater difficulty arises for these men who have charge of its enforcement. Therefore I am in favor of regarding this not as an expenditure but as an investment, and I am in favor of giving these men who are serving this community, which is the National Capital of America, some increase, and allow them to have the compensation that men should have in hazardous occupations.

We realize that the miner is a man of that type who is subjecting himself to dangers, and he should be paid accordingly, and the same is true with respect to the locomotive engineers, and that they should be paid more than the ordinary man in the quiet pursuits of life; and therefore I favor this bill and shall ardently support it, and I hope that we shall be able to give these men better opportunities for themselves and families, and I am sure that they will deserve it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this bill, and I may wander a little in doing so. I was in some doubt in the beginning as to whether the provision of this bill which gives Sunday, or a day off in the week in lieu of service, was the proper thing to be done, but I find on some investigation

that it is becoming the practice all over the United States. It has been the policy in the city from which I come for a long while, and I understand that as a result of that it is altogether likely that you will get a better class of men; at any rate you will do more justice to whatever class of men you get.

I do not think the wages proposed are higher perhaps than they ought to be under existing circumstances, so that I shall very cheerfully support the bill.

For one I was sorry not to have been here to speak on the question of inspectors. I do not think there should be any differentiation in the pay granted to inspectors. I think all inspectors should be paid alike. I notice that this bill provides that one inspector, while serving as head of the detective service, shall be given the rank of assistant superintendent and \$250 additional pay. I do not think the work of an inspector of the detective service is any more important than the work of inspectors of other services. It may be, but I doubt it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. He is in charge of 30 men under him, and he is responsible for what they do. Does not the gentleman think we should pay \$250 extra to him?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, the other inspectors also have men under them, and they are responsible for them.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. You recognize the difference in the service?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I recognize what the difference in the service is, but I do not see any difference in the importance of the service. I do not think it requires a man to be a greater genius as inspector in the detective service than in the traffic service or any other service. In fact, I think the man in charge of the traffic service has a much more arduous job than the other man. He does not deal with the same class of cases, it is true.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. We pay the distinguished gentleman from Illinois \$7,500 a year—

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; \$150 a week—

Mr. BLANTON. And that is about one-fourth of what the gentleman could make at home—

Mr. MADDEN. About one-tenth—

Mr. BLANTON. But the man who presides over the gentleman, the man who presides over the House, the Speaker, receives \$12,000, or \$4,500 more, because he is the supervising officer.

Mr. MADDEN. But the inspector of the detective service has jurisdiction over only a certain branch of the police work. If you are going to call one branch of the police work more important than any other, it is all right. But you are simply giving to Mr. Grant an increase of pay because his name is Grant or because he presides over the detective service. I do not know which it is.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The committee looked upon the detective force of the District of Columbia as the most important branch of the work in the city. The members of the detective force are all selected, and the sergeants and other officers are given a little increase over the other policemen. The privates get \$60 a year more.

Mr. BLANTON. They are sergeants. It is not because they are privates but sergeants. They are detective sergeants.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. They can be sent back at any time.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. Then they will be demoted when that is done. But whatever the committee did, I suppose, is wise, and I will not controvert that.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I understood the gentleman to say that he would support the bill and that the salaries were satisfactory.

Mr. MADDEN. I say they are not exorbitant.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. The raises are about from 10 to 25 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; it is about 25 per cent increase in cost, because of the fact that they are given one day a week off.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. There is a bill drawn to increase the compensation of the employees of the House. I understand that increase will be about 5 per cent. Why not give the House employees an increase commensurate with these employees of the city?

Mr. MADDEN. What the House authorized the gentleman from Illinois, and those associated with him, to do was to reclassify the salaries in accordance with the reclassification act, and we are carrying out the instructions of the House. If the House does not agree with us when we report, the gentleman knows what it can do.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the committee amendments.

The question was taken, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. That in lieu of Sunday there shall be granted to the Metropolitan police and to each officer and member of the fire department of the District of Columbia one day off out of each week of seven days, which shall be in addition to his annual leave and sick leave now allowed by law; *Provided, however,* That whenever the Commissioners of the District of Columbia declare that an emergency exists of such a character as to require the continuous service of all the members of the Metropolitan police force, the major and superintendent of police shall have authority, and it shall be his duty, to suspend and discontinue the granting of the said one day off in seven during the continuation of such emergency.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 23, strike out the figure "4" and insert the figure "3."

Page 4, line 6, after the word "force" insert the words "and the members of the fire department."

Page 4, line 8, after the word "police" insert the words "and the chief engineer of the fire department."

Page 4, line 9, strike out the word "his" and insert the word "their."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The question was taken, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. That the salaries herein provided for shall be payable on and after July 1, 1924.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 12, strike out the figure "5" and insert the figure "4."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHANDLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5855) to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BLANTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MUSCLE SHOALS.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules on House Resolution 169 for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 169, for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 518.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 169.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R.

518. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 10 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the acting chairman and some member of the Military Affairs Committee opposed to this bill, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall arise and report the bill to the House, with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

PREVENTION OF VENEREAL DISEASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 491) for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 30 minutes, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 30 minutes, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question now is on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 491) for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 491) for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 491, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 491. For the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Kentucky 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, before confining myself exclusively to the consideration of this bill I want to make a few observations upon the attitude of the membership of the House toward business presented to it by the District Committee and toward the District itself, especially as so many observations have been made along those lines in the debate on the previous bill.

I consider the personnel of this committee as high as that of any committee in this House when the purposes for which it is created are taken into consideration, and yet I regret to say that whenever any business is presented to this House by the District Committee most of the Members of the House immediately leave, and the business is subjected to criticism and facelessness by those who remain.

A few moments ago some gentleman made the remark that he would follow the membership of this committee, and that was the first time I had ever heard such an indulgence presented and I was very much impressed by it.

Now, for the benefit of the House I will run over the membership of this committee. I desire to discuss the personnel of this committee.

The chairman of this committee is the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. REED], who was formerly State senator and secretary of state of West Virginia, and who in his State was prominent in educational work. He was a member of the International tax conference in 1909, and he has for seven years been active in District legislation.

The acting chairman of this committee is the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN], who was former president of

the Maryland State Federation of Labor, active in manufacturing and real estate. He was formerly the leader of the senate of his State, and he has been active in District legislation for five years.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAMPERT] is an active business man and has been active in District of Columbia legislation for seven years.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KELLER] was former commissioner of the city of St. Paul, has been active in the administration of city affairs there for several years, especially that phase of it dealing with public utilities. He has been active in legislation for the District of Columbia.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] was a member of the Massachusetts Legislature for 10 years; is a manufacturer by business, has been in close touch with the city administration of Boston, and active in District affairs since a Member of Congress.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD] is a lawyer, war veteran, officer, and has been active in city affairs of the city of Dayton, in war veterans' associations, and District legislation since a Member of Congress.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD] is a lawyer, war veteran, former officer, and active in the city administration of the great city of Detroit.

The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] is a lawyer, former president of the State Senate of Vermont, war veteran, and banker.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BEERS] is a lawyer and has been actively interested in banking and agriculture.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RATHBONE] is a lawyer, a former resident of this District, and now a Congressman at large from the State of Illinois. He has been an active participant in the State and city administrations of his State and city, and has a splendid knowledge of the civic administration of Chicago.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. STALKER] is a banker, a manufacturer, and has been active in business affairs.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULLIVAN] is a resident of New York City; engaged in the real-estate business; has been active in the State senate of New York, especially in corporation legislation, public health, labor, and industry.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is a lawyer, has been on the bench, and has been active in District matters since being in Congress.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] was on the bench eight years before coming to Congress.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMMER] is a lawyer, active in educational affairs, former United States attorney, and has been active in District legislation since being in Congress.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. O'BRIEN] is a lawyer and judge, active, and acquainted with civic administration in Hudson County, N. J.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KUNZ] is a resident of Chicago, has been actively identified with the city administration of that great city, and interested in District legislation since being in Congress.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JOST] is a former mayor of the great municipality of Kansas City and a lawyer by profession.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE] has been active in educational affairs of his community, county superintendent of education, president of State Teachers and State County Superintendents' Association.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KENT] has been active in municipalities as attorney and counsel for municipalities in his State.

I run over this list for the purpose of assuring this House that for the purpose of civic administration I do not believe, former training and environment considered, the membership of this House could have been bettered in its selection than the committee that has been selected. So that I do not believe that the indifference which this House seems to pay to matters coming from the District Committee and concerning the District itself is directed at the personnel of that committee.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I have been very much interested in the history of the personnel of this committee which the gentlemen has given, but I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Is the record of these gentlemen, as disclosed by the Congressional Directory that the gentleman took this from, better or worse than the other Members of Congress? It is about the average, is it not?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes, I should say so; but I am pointing out that their former acquaintance with civic affairs and their training before coming to Congress fitted them peculiarly for their service on this committee.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. In point of fact, does the gentleman think there is a single Member of Congress who prior to coming to this House has not had equal experience?

Mr. GILBERT. I of course can not judge of that.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think they are all qualified? Does the gentleman think there is a Member in the Congress, with the possible exception of the gentleman from Georgia, whose experience prior to coming to Congress is not such that he ought to be qualified to fill the position of a member of the city council of Washington?

Mr. GILBERT. I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Georgia and, of course, nothing I said was intended or could be construed as a reflection on the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I did not so take it, but I am speaking of the general membership of the House. Is not that true?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes; and I repeat that this committee, as compared with the general membership of the House, is entitled to consideration on matters presented by it to this Congress concerning the District of Columbia.

It is not a pleasant committee to serve upon. By being in proximity with the people for whom we are dealing, we are subject to importunities, and it is unquestionably one of the disagreeable committees to serve upon. I heard a Member of this House say the other day that a Member was entitled to sympathy who got on the District Committee, but if he stayed on it he deserved only censure.

The attitude of Congress to the District itself, in my opinion, is too often treated as the gentleman from Georgia, perhaps, showed a disposition to-day to treat the District and its matters, instead of being in the attitude of considering it a ward of Congress, treating it in a hostile attitude. I have heard from time to time Members rise on this floor and anything affecting the District or the District's welfare would be treated as if it were in opposition to the general conduct of the country itself.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Does not the gentleman think that that condition really exists because the District of Columbia and the people of the District of Columbia insist more on securing appropriations than they do on giving real service in the way of law enforcement and protecting the lives of the Members of Congress and those who come here to live.

Mr. GILBERT. I will say to the gentleman that for over a century and a quarter, ever since the Constitution was adopted, the District of Columbia has been the ward of Congress, subject to its exclusive control, and if there is any wrong existing in the District of Columbia, Congress itself is to blame.

Mr. LANKFORD. Does not the gentleman see more in the newspapers urging appropriations than the gentleman sees in the papers urging law enforcement and the protection of the rights of the people living here?

Mr. GILBERT. Oh, it is, of course, human nature to want all they can get, and it is the duty of the gentleman who has just taken his seat, and all other gentlemen, to protect the country; and it is also their duty at the same time to realize that this is their city.

It was the dream of Washington, of Jefferson, and of the framers of the Constitution that this city should grow up not only the center of beauty but the center of wealth, refinement, culture, education, and art; and I am informed by the gentleman who is the chairman of the Library Committee [Mr. LUCE], a gentleman in position to know, that there are to-day in Washington, making their homes here, more scientific men than in any other city in the world; and Congress, while dealing fairly with the country at large, should, I feel, be imbued with those same ideals that were fostered by the founders of this Republic when they set aside this District not as a city for the people of Washington to live in so much but as the home of the President, the home of Congress, and the official home of 110,000,000 of people and not alone of the 437,000 people who live within its borders.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana and Mr. LANKFORD rose.

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I do not want to interfere with the gentleman's trend of thought, but does the gentleman intend a little later to come to a discussion of the bill itself, because I want to ask some questions about that?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes; right now.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Does not the gentleman think the very fact that Washington and our forefathers had such a lofty ideal for the city of Washington authorizes us to now beg for and plead for the enforcement of law in the District of Columbia and for a better observance of the rights of the people living here?

Mr. GILBERT. To get to a discussion of this particular bill, if there is any legislation that is needed, according to the opinion of military and medical circles, it is the bill before you. Within the last few years the people have realized that venereal disease is more prevalent than tuberculosis. It is more insidious than cancer. As a result, practically every State in the United States has passed a bill similar to but not identical with the bill we have before us.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That is what I want to ask about. I have read the provisions of the bill and it seems to me they are unusually drastic. I note the statement in the report that a number of the States have adopted laws, and I wondered if any State had adopted a law which had the provisions of this law which gives the right to the health officer to examine any individual person and see whether he is afflicted with the disease.

Mr. GILBERT. I will come to the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana and say, not only yes, but more drastic than is provided by this bill. When our boys were inducted into the service of the United States it is astounding to know that between 27 and 28 per cent were afflicted with a venereal disease to a distinguishable extent. That of itself shows the necessity for this legislation. We had several bills presented and chief among them was the bill presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER]. It was on the discussion of that bill that this bill was produced. I am not the champion of this character of legislation. We realized that we were going far contrary to the liberties and privacies of people in legislation of this kind by reason of the fact that this disease is different from diseases of general contagion and infection; but we did not go so far as many of the laws of the other States provide.

The bill of the gentleman from California was similar to most of the laws in operation in various States, but the committee thought that while a man had no compunction in informing the authorities that he was afflicted with a contagious disease and seeking its prevention or cure, such as typhoid or diphtheria, that this character of disease carried with it a condition of odium. No sensible man will report to any health authorities that he is afflicted with venereal disease, because, as I say, it immediately subjects him to the suspicion of immorality. So it is to be dealt with very carefully and frequently the very privacies of people, in order to get effective legislation, have to be invaded.

I assure the gentleman from Indiana and the members of the committee that this bill goes into that matter more delicately and to less extent than any bill that I have seen from any State in the Union, and I have examined most of them.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I call attention particularly to section 5, which provides that it shall be the duty of the health officer or some physician authorized to practice medicine in the District of Columbia when directed by the health officer to make examination of persons whom the health officer believes and has reasonable grounds to believe is afflicted with these diseases. He does that regardless of what the person may say. He can not make the examination over the objection of the person, but if he does object the officer can file an affidavit that he believes it and have a trial on the question of examination. It seems to me that that is pretty strong law.

Mr. GILBERT. Other States in the Union go further than that and provide that if the health officer on information believes that a person is so afflicted, they can be examined then and there. In order to prevent the health officer from unduly interfering with the rights of an individual, we provide that he can not make the examination until he appears before the court and has a rule showing cause for the party to appear, and then they must appear. The purpose of that is to insure that the health officer will not make a frivolous and fictitious complaint. The law is that if the person in good faith does not believe he has venereal disease, he can on a writ of habeas corpus require the reasonable grounds to be submitted to the court itself. To that extent this bill is less drastic than other States. These laws have been upheld as to their constitutionality and have been found necessary by the court in the regulation of public health. The constitutionality of the law has been upheld in many cases, three of which I have before me. There is one in the One hundred and eightieth Pacific Reporter, page 644; there is one in the State of California; one

case from Oklahoma; one from Texas, that I have here. In fact, gentlemen, realizing the seriousness of this matter I have reports upholding the constitutionality of every clause in this bill.

Under the Raker bill, which is similar to the laws of most States of the Union, when one goes to the drug store for medicine for this disease he must give his name and address for a record to the druggist whereby the drug store will have the record that this person is so afflicted. In this bill we tried to provide so strongly for the rights of the individual that his misfortune can not be made public unless he has violated the rules of the health officer or his own physician in charge.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. It is provided in section 3 as follows:

Sec. 3. That the report herein required shall state in writing the disease from which the person is suffering, his name, age, sex, color, occupation, marital state, and address.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. And also on the top of page 3 there is the same requirement.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. It seems to me that you are exposing a man instead of protecting him.

Mr. GILBERT. But the gentleman overlooks where that health report is. That is not in a drug store, but that is in the health department, and then not in there until he has first violated the regulations of the department itself, or of his own family physician. Under the other bills and the laws prevalent in most of the States of the Union that becomes a public record, whether he is guilty of any misconduct or not. Under the provisions of this bill that can not be recorded, and that report is not sent in until he has first violated the instructions of the health officers.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Let me then ask this question: In the first section it is provided that the chief administrative officer of every penal institution "in which or in attendance upon which there is a person having syphilis," and so forth. That appears to me as I understand the language that he may report anybody who might happen to be even in attendance there as a witness. What does the gentleman mean by that language?

Mr. GILBERT. The gentleman brings out the provisions of the bill by his questions.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. It may include somebody who just simply happened to be attending there.

Mr. GILBERT. While the statement I just made, that he must first violate some regulations provided for his own protection, applies to practically all of the population, this bill necessarily makes an exception of those already in some penal institution. Let me read the provision:

That every chief administrative officer of every penal institution in which or in attendance upon which there is a person having syphilis, gonorrhea, or chancroid shall immediately upon becoming aware of that fact report the circumstances to the health officer as hereinafter provided.

It was my thought, whether it meets with the opinion of this committee or not, that a person already in some penal institution would not be seriously affected if it developed that he was at the same time suffering from some venereal disease, and that became necessary by reason of an incident which happened in this very town. It appears from the police court record in this town that many soldiers were infected at the same place. The proof showed that they had become infected with this venereal disease by going to the same house, and although the authorities knew where it was they were helpless to take any steps to prevent its spread.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Do I understand from what the gentleman says that there is a bawdy house maintained in the city of Washington? Why, I thought they were abolished years ago.

Mr. GILBERT. I mean to say only that the proof showed that these soldiers had gone to one house and had become infected with this disease. The gentleman can draw his own deduction in respect to the character of this house.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Does the gentleman not think that the provisions of this bill are such that it will be used to humiliate people and actually interfere with domestic relations? Suppose a man's wife should get the notion that he is unfaithful. Under the provisions of this bill she could go out and report him and say to the police, "I want you to take my husband out in the alley and examine him." Is not that possible under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. GILBERT. I say that the gentleman is totally ignorant of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I would like to have the gentleman convince me that he was not also ignorant as to its effect in the introduction of it, and discuss it so that he can enlighten me if that is not a sensible deduction to draw from it. Will the gentleman show me that is not possible? I know that I am very ignorant, but I think I compare favorably with the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GILBERT. Oh, the gentleman is not ignorant; he is of very high standing; but I say and repeat that he is ignorant of the provisions of this bill, and I confine that statement simply to the provisions of the bill.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Is not that possible under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. GILBERT. It is not.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Why?

Mr. GILBERT. Because if the gentleman will turn to section 5 he will see that it is not. First let me point out to the gentleman from Georgia that if he had any knowledge about legislation on venereal diseases—

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Oh, let us not talk so much of my lack of knowledge.

Mr. GILBERT. I decline to yield further to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. The gentleman will find it is a little more pleasant if he will simply answer the question.

Mr. GILBERT. Legislation provided in all of the States of the Union is subject to the criticism of the gentleman from Georgia. The Raker bill introduced here does so provide, and for fear that somebody might use this to have some employee even of the board of health, which the Raker bill provides, make this examination, for fear that some police officer, as suggested by the gentleman from Georgia, might have some ulterior motive in examining somebody, or some member of the health department might not act in good faith, I have provided by section 5 of the bill, which protects the individual more than the law of any State of the Union, that it shall be the duty of the chief health officer—not even of an employee—to make this examination, and no law of the United States on this subject gives that much protection. Nobody, not even in the health department, can make this examination except the health officer, and who else? Some employee or policeman or agent or governmental clerk? Oh, no. It must be some physician authorized to practice medicine in the District of Columbia and directed by the health officer.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. He has the examination just the same.

Mr. GILBERT. The health officer and some physician directed by the health officer alone has this in charge.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every chief administrative officer of every penal institution in which or in attendance upon which there is a person having syphilis, gonorrhea, or chancroid shall immediately upon becoming aware of that fact report the circumstances to the health officer as hereinafter provided.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would not make this motion to strike out the enacting clause were I not satisfied in my own mind that this bill not only ought not to pass in its present form, but that it can not be made in Committee of the Whole into such a bill as we should pass. I say that with great respect for the distinguished gentleman who is the author of the bill, who has made a study of this question and is earnest in his desire to cure a great evil in the District.

May I have unanimous consent for 10 minutes on this?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. With the understanding, of course, that I shall desire about five or six minutes to answer the gentleman.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman is entitled to it.

The CHAIRMAN. It can not be done without unanimous consent.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall want at least five minutes to answer the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, what is the request?

The CHAIRMAN. That he may proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I am in favor of that, but I would like to make the suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that there ought to be a little more time allowed under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that he shall have 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I would like to have the attention of the committee while I make an analysis of this bill. There are parts of it which are absolutely out of keeping with good legislation.

Section 2 provides that when any person is brought before the judge of the juvenile court or a judge of any court for trial and investigation and the judge believes or has reasonable ground to believe that any such person is afflicted with syphilis, gonorrhea, or chancroid, he shall immediately report said fact to the health officer. If the person is brought before the judge for drunkenness, the judge immediately reports to the health officer that he believes the person is afflicted with one of these venereal diseases, and the report shall give his name. Then the health officer "shall use every available means to ascertain the existence of and to investigate all cases of syphilis, gonorrhea, or chancroid of which they have or may receive information and to ascertain the sources of such infection."

That is the provision of section 4. Then section 5 provides that it shall be the duty of the health officer or some other physician to make examination of all persons who the health officer believes or has reasonable ground to believe is afflicted with any of these diseases, but it says the examination can not be made if the person objects, unless he has an order of court.

You might think they would have a right of trial. But section 6 provides that whenever a person suspected refuses to submit to said examination it is the duty of the health officer to file an affidavit before any judge of the police court or the judge of any court having criminal jurisdiction. Thereupon the judge, without trial or any hearing whatever, shall issue an order and name the time and the place, and the person must appear and be examined or be punished for contempt.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Section 3, if I understand that section, means when he comes before this judge here the report is made down to the Public Health Service, he giving his name, occupation, and age, and everything else?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes. That first part refers to persons in penal institutions or persons convicted. But this part that I am talking about refers to every person in the District. When the health officer believes that any person is afflicted with any of these diseases, he must submit to an examination, or a report is made to the judge, and the judge must order, and the judge names the time and place for examination. If the person does not come there for the examination, he is in contempt of court and can be fined or imprisoned, but it does not say definitely what the punishment shall be.

Now, let us trace this on down. Section 8 provides that the health officer must quarantine anyone suffering from this disease.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. Is that disease as serious as measles or scarlet fever practically, or something of that kind that is quarantined? Why should it not be quarantined?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. All right, if the gentleman believes in it. I am simply pointing out what it does. Then in section 11—listen to this provision—no person can purchase medicine at a drug store to cure the disease. You have got to get a prescription from a physician, and no drug store can sell any of the medicines that can be used for the cure of these diseases. It also provides that no person can get a prescription filled unless he has a doctor's prescription, and it must be the prescription of a doctor in the District of Columbia. You can not go out into Maryland and there get a doctor's prescription and fill it here. It must be a doctor authorized to practice medicine in the District of Columbia.

Then the thirteenth provision provides that he shall be isolated. Mr. Chairman, I could go on and analyze the remainder of these provisions, and there are 21 of them; but time will not permit.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. What does that mean?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. It does not say that if a doctor thinks a person is afflicted with gonorrhea and should be quarantined it shall be done, but it says the health officer must quarantine everyone afflicted with that disease. And then, in section 21, there is a provision that any person who violates any of the provisions of this act shall, on conviction thereof, be punished for the first offense by a fine not exceeding \$100,

and for the second or any subsequent offenses by a fine not exceeding \$300, or by imprisonment in the workhouse for not exceeding 30 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

Now, gentlemen of the House, I do not want you to understand that I do not realize that you have a great evil to deal with. You have, but the liberties of our people are entitled to more consideration than is given in this bill. This bill goes further than any measure I have ever seen.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. Does the gentleman know about the law in his own State of Indiana?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. No; I do not know that I do.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman's own State law is more drastic and does not give the protection to the unfortunate that this bill does.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I do not think the law as written in Indiana is like this, but if it does not more carefully guard the rights of the individual than this bill does it is not of much value.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Is it not a fact that the State acts referred to have had written into them many of the odious things to which the gentleman has called attention, and thereby have become a practical nullity and scarcely any attention is paid to them?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I do not know, but I do know this: That throughout this country men are not quarantined on account of having the diseases mentioned here; they are not quarantined while this bill says they shall be; throughout the country they do purchase medicines from the drug stores for the cure of these diseases, but this bill says no man shall do so.

Mr. KELLER. I think the gentleman is mistaken as far as quarantine is concerned, if he will read the bill.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I have read that provision.

Mr. GILBERT. The gentleman is right in using the word quarantine, but the committee investigated that pretty carefully, and quarantine, as the committee understood it, means any degree of quarantine, which simply may be, as provided and permitted in this bill, an admonition by the doctor to stay in the house, or in the case of school children the quarantine might permit them to do certain labor but not to go to school. Quarantine is a very broad term as construed by the courts.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Everybody knows what quarantine means, and here is the language:

That the chief health officer is authorized and directed—

It is not within his discretion, but he is directed—

to order the quarantine of any person who is found under the provisions of this act to have—

Any one of these diseases. Now, it has not been very many months since we sent a similar bill back to the committee on a motion to recommit or strike out the enacting clause.

This measure will never pass in the House of Representatives; unless you make some provision that will be helpful you will never have this sort of a law on the statute books of the United States.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. I call the gentleman's attention to section 16 for the purpose of asking whether or not, in his judgment, that section could be uniformly enforced?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Why, certainly not. That thing would be impossible.

Section 16 reads:

That every physician practicing medicine in the District of Columbia shall report to the health officer within 10 days any case of syphilis, gonorrhea, or chancroid which he has been employed to treat, but said report shall be used for statistical purposes and shall in no event disclose the identity of the person so treated except under the conditions in this act provided.

Certainly it is impossible to enforce that.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I will ask the gentleman with reference to section 14.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. There are so many provisions, and I have only reached the high places and pointed out the reason why this ought not to be passed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the only trouble about most of our criminal laws is that in legislatures they are largely framed to protect the rights of criminals instead of the rights of the law-abiding people.

And so it is with laws concerning immoral actions not constituting crime. We think more of protecting the one guilty of immorality than of protecting the innocent public suffering because of it. We have laws with reference to all contagious diseases—scarlet fever, for instance, which is now prevailing over Washington—and those laws provide that when a member of a family takes it they must segregate themselves, in the interest of the good of society, from the body politic. To protect the whole instead of the few they have to go to many inconveniences; they have to go through certain performances in having their furniture and clothing fumigated and their houses fumigated when the disease is over; all for the protection of society.

I am not thinking so much about the protection of the unfortunate individuals who are spoken of in this bill as I am of society. I am thinking more of the womanhood of the land, the young girls of our country and the young manhood not yet contaminated than I am the ones we are now restricting.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BOX. I do not suppose there will be any disagreement about the desire to protect society, but I am wondering how the gentleman feels about the power that this bill gives to officials, or to others vested with this power, to abuse it in its exercise and the degree to which it subjects men to abuse who should not be subjected to it.

Mr. BLANTON. I catch the gentleman's point and I will try to answer it. This bill is designed to protect society against an individual who has a loathsome disease which he does not make public.

He does not advertise it. He keeps it a secret to himself. You have got to have some kind of restriction in such a case if you protect society. This bill was framed by a man who has had much experience in law matters, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT]. He was formerly a distinguished judge on the bench. He is its author. The gentleman from Kentucky has spent much time in its preparation. The committee, composed of some lawyers and some laymen, took it under consideration and thrashed it over. In that committee there were several bills of this nature pending. There were some, more drastic, far beyond the provisions of this bill. The committee thrashed all out with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] and with members of the committee and agreed upon this measure. I know it does place some restrictions on certain individuals. There should be such restrictions placed upon them. Why should there not be? Why should they not report such a matter to their family physician? That is all it requires them to do. It requires them to report to their family physician, just like they would if they had scarlet fever, and why should they not do that?

Mr. WOLFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLFF. Will it prevent these men who are working as orderlies out at Walter Reed and who have this same disease from serving and handling the food out there?

Mr. BLANTON. It provides they shall report it immediately to some physician, who would then use precautions to protect others. As it is now they do not have to do that. They can continue to do the very thing the gentleman says they are doing, but if you pass this bill they have got to report it to some physician—their family physician of their own choosing. He does not make the matter public. It is kept within his own breast and his own bosom as the physician of the individual.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. If I understand the provisions of this bill, he can not go to a drug store here in the city of Washington and procure a prescription?

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad my colleague asked that question.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Wait a moment. Let me finish the question. But there is nothing in this bill that prohibits him from going across the line over into Maryland and into any drug store across the line and getting all the medicine he wants.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad my colleague from Georgia mentioned that because that is one of the main reasons for the passage of this bill. Let a young boy unfortunately contract a bad disease and he will not go to a doctor, when if he would go to a doctor he could be relieved in a week or ten days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for two minutes more to answer the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Instead of going to a good physician he will sneak around to a drug store and get some kind of cheap patent medicine that is well advertised, and the first thing you know all the doctors in the land can not cure him. What he wants is expert medical advice, and expert medical treatment, and if it were my boy I would want him to go to a doctor and to the best doctor he could get. If it was my colleague's boy, he would want him to go to a doctor. He would not want him to go to a drug store around the corner and buy some 25-cent box of patent medicine that would do him more harm, possibly, than if he did not take it. That is the very purpose of this bill, to prevent it.

We ought not to get scared because our friend from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] has moved to strike out the enacting clause. We do not have to strike it out. This is not a matter that has been brought before the House hurriedly. It is a matter that your District Committee—as one member of it, I will say—for several years has had under consideration, and I think every member of the District Committee that has been on it any length of time has had this matter before him for years and has been giving it careful consideration. I hope my colleagues will not get disturbed about some little restriction that is placed around individuals that ought to have restrictions placed around them. I think we ought to pass this bill; and I think if my colleague from Georgia knew the full necessity of it, he would be the strongest advocate on the floor here fighting for it.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. What about section 11 as to advertisements of medicines?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think they ought to be advertised, concerning these particular diseases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] be given five minutes on the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not want to object and shall not object, but I think there ought also to be given a little opportunity for other gentlemen to be heard who desire to strike out the enacting clause. I think we ought to have a free discussion of this matter. This is a pretty big question. I certainly want to hear the gentleman from Kentucky, but let it be with the understanding that the gentleman from Maryland will not oppose other gentlemen being heard.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to modify my request by asking that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] have five minutes and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] have five minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I wish the gentleman would ask for 10 minutes additional so that other gentlemen can also discuss the matter.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No one else has asked for such an opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the debate on the motion to strike out the enacting clause be extended 10 minutes, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] to have five minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] to have five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILBERT. Gentlemen of the committee, I want to reiterate that my connection with this bill was not by any reason of any personal desire on my part to advance any legislation whatever. I was simply on the subcommittee to which was referred all of these different bills, and as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has said, we considered this matter all through the last Congress.

We have considered the laws of many States dealing with this subject. We have consulted the health authorities all over the United States, and not only during the last Congress but during this Congress. After our deliberation the committee unanimously came to the conclusion that this bill should be presented because, more than any bill that was presented to the committee and more than the law of any State in the Union, it preserved the privacies and individual rights of the individuals. Of course, the subject itself is such that to a certain extent the privacies of the people must be invaded, and the only question you have to determine, in my opinion, is whether or not the prevalence and character of the disease is such that

for the protection of the boys and girls and the innocent public, these rights should be given up by those who are reasonably suspected by the health officer in whom we should have confidence.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Do you claim this power under the police power of the State?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes; under the police power.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. You believe, then, that under the police power you can deprive the accused of the right to trial?

Mr. GILBERT. I will say to the gentleman from Utah that it goes to this extent: Of course, you can not deprive him of that right if he cares to take out a writ of habeas corpus. He is then entitled to have it determined on the merits of whether or not the health officer has reasonable ground to believe that he is so afflicted. That has been determined and I can give the gentleman the decision upholding that position.

There is one more thing I want to bring out and then I am through.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. I think we are all agreed upon doing everything possible to protect not only the afflicted but the innocent. The thing that appeals to me is whether this bill does not have in it grave danger of having innocent persons wrongfully accused of something which would hold them up to shame in the community.

Mr. GILBERT. To a certain extent it does and necessarily must put great powers in the health officer, I would say to the gentleman from Utah. It enables him to say whether or not he has reasonable grounds to believe that this person is so afflicted.

Now, I want to answer the gentleman's suggestion as to the right to buy this medicine. All the medical authorities agree that this disease, more than any other disease known to the human body, requires individual treatment. What would be beneficial to a disease in its incipency would not be beneficial to one in the advanced stages, and by the application of a nostrum it was shown that a person who was afflicted in its incipency took a prescription for one in the advanced stages and became totally blind.

It is not a pleasant thing to talk about; but whenever you go to the water-closet you find a little circular placed on the door, "Go to the drug store and get a prescription No. so-and-so" or "Call for so-and-so," and that is plastered all over this country. Of course, I do not know, but the medical authorities agree that it is absolutely disastrous in its effect. It was for that purpose, and for that purpose only, that we incorporated in the bill that they must have a prescription from a physician, so that they would be assured that cases would get individual treatment. That provision of the bill has been upheld as constitutional and salutary by three different high courts of this country.

As to the wisdom of this legislation and this particular bill, I want to say that I have letters of recommendation from the United States Social Hygiene Board; I have them from the medical department of the Army approving this bill. I have it from civic workers throughout the United States. This bill protects the citizens that do not have this disease from its terrific ravages.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there are several provisions in the bill to which I can not subscribe. Take, for instance, section 11. It says:

That it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to advertise within the District of Columbia any medicine or remedy, by number of prescriptions or otherwise, for the treatment, cure, or prevention, etc.

I can understand very well that certain classes of men would favor a provision like that in legislation. There is probably not a doctor practicing in the city that would object to it. But, gentlemen, it is not every man in this country that is practicing medicine that knows all about it. There are many men who have sense enough to put up prescriptions that doctors themselves recommend. If we want to do something radical, why not regulate the trade; why not regulate the druggists; why not provide that the druggist who is known to sell medicines, patent or otherwise, unfit for this specific purpose for which recommended shall be punished? Why say that a man shall not advertise? I do not believe that is legal.

Mr. KENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KENT. Has the gentleman ever seen an advertisement designed to foster the sale of medicine for the prevention or cure of diphtheria or scarlet fever?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I do not know that I have, but I assume that there are such instances.

Mr. KENT. The gentleman would not approve of advertisements of that kind?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I would if they were good remedies. I would not try to prevent them by legislation if they were good remedies. I think if my child had diphtheria or scarlet fever I would want to get a doctor to prescribe for it, but that is no reason why I would object to an advertisement of a remedy which was thought to be efficient or which other men said was efficient.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose a physician should determine that the taking of a patent medicine would result in death in most cases in scarlet fever and diphtheria, would the gentleman stop the advertisement of that patent medicine?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I do not believe that the doctors think anybody is going to get killed in this way.

Mr. BLANTON. But the consensus of most of the doctors is that these boys ought to go to a physician.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Oh, yes; but the very thing you are doing will prevent his going to a doctor. Under section 13 you say that he shall be isolated. The boy knows that if he goes to a doctor he will be isolated. He will say, "Oh, yes; John Smith was a fool, he went to a doctor and he is out here in quarantine, and I won't go." The result may be that the boy will walk around and die of the disease. Why, gentlemen, I have seen some politicians walk around straddling on issues. They have straddled so long until they walk straddle legged. If you enact the proposed law, before long they will be up before some health officer for examination. [Laughter.]

Why should we want to do such a foolish thing? I assume that the persons coming within the provisions of the bill would be isolated according to the disease with which they may be afflicted. Therefore you must have at least three quarantine stations. What funds do you provide for them? How long are they to be kept in quarantine? Do you know what this bill would cost, have you figured it up, can you calculate it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 10, noes 15.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if nobody else does it, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that and call for tellers.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-five Members present; not a quorum.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 491) for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 3, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

387. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copy of letter from the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, dated February 4, 1924, describing certain valueless records which are no longer needed for use in connection with the transaction of public business, and have no permanent value or historical interest; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

388. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, to remain available until June 30, 1925, for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals, \$1,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 211); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7111. A bill to promote American agriculture by making more extensively available by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad, and in other ways; without amendment (Rept. No. 248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7449. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1192. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court, Northern District of California, to adjudicate the claims of American citizens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNEIL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 169. A resolution providing for the immediate consideration of H. R. 518; without amendment (Rept. 254). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6233) granting a pension to Louise Donovan, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 7449) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 7450) to provide for the promotion of physical education in the United States through co-operation with the States in the preparation and payment of supervisors and teachers of physical education, to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BUCKLEY: A bill (H. R. 7451) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon to be used as a post office at Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7452) for the payment to certain members of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians of their share of the proceeds of sale of tribal lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7453) to amend an act approved March 3, 1909, entitled "An act for the removal of the restrictions on alienation of lands of allottees of the Quapaw Agency, Okla., and the sale of all tribal lands, school, agency, or other buildings on any of the reservations within the jurisdiction of such agency, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 7454) to empower the President to classify certain offices, places, and employments under the provisions of the civil service law; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7455) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the States in which located, Government owned or controlled approach roads to the national cemeteries and national military parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAVROT: A bill (H. R. 7456) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Covington, St. Tammany Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7457) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Baton Rouge, East Baton Rouge Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7458) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Plaquemine, Iberville Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7459) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bogalusa, Washington Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7460) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Donaldsonville, Ascension Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 7461) amending the provisions of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1921, which amends the act to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, approved June 5, 1920; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7462) to amend the interstate commerce act and the transportation act, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7463) to amend the interstate commerce act by providing that telegraph and telephone and cable companies shall be made subject to the act and be required to file and publish tariffs and be liable for damage sustained by any persons by reason of the negligence or omission of such company; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7464) to amend paragraphs (18), (19), (20), and (21) of section 1 of the act to regulate commerce, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 7465) authorizing the Secretary of War to lease or, in his discretion, to convey by quitclaim deed a certain tract of land in the military reservation of Santa Rosa Island; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 7466) to regulate the operation of motor-propelled vehicles in the District of Columbia and to provide penalties for its violation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 7467) to amend subdivision (a) of section 19, Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7468) for the erection of a post-office building at Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 202) authorizing the Committee on Patents to inquire into the operations of the United States Army Air Service, Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, the United States Mail Air Service, or any agency, branch, or subsidiary of either; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 7469) granting an increase of pension to David W. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 7470) granting a pension to Mary Marker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7471) granting an increase of pension to James A. Garner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7472) granting a pension to Mary A. Raglin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7473) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Strawn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7474) granting a pension to Adidamlah Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREDERICKS: A bill (H. R. 7475) granting a pension to Laura C. Dupree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 7476) granting a pension to John Abear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7477) granting a pension to David Abear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 7478) for the relief of Liberty-loan subscribers of the Robbinsdale State Bank, Robbinsdale, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7479) for the relief of Joseph Lane; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7480) for the relief of Dwight L. Wagner; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 7481) granting a pension to Sarah J. Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 7482) granting a pension to Adaline LaFollett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROESION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7483) granting a pension to Taylor Wagers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7484) granting an increase of pension to Bell L. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 7485) to make a preliminary survey of the Cimarron River, in Oklahoma, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 7486) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Tedrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 7487) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Martin A. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7488) granting a pension to Margaret E. Farmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1459. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of National Association of Table Manufacturers, Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to effect a reduction in first-class rates by making drop-letter rate 1 cent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1460. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring tax reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1461. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., requesting repeal of war taxes on motor vehicles and motor parts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1462. Also (by request), petition of the National Association of Builders' Exchanges, opposing a bonus bill and favoring appropriations to provide for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1463. Also (by request), petition of the National Association of Builders' Exchanges, favoring a constitutional amendment that would authorize an assessment of income tax on incomes derived from bonds issued by States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1464. Also (by request), petition of board of aldermen of the city of New York, urging Congress to extend relief to the starving and needy people of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1465. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of Hope Council, No. 6, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Westerly, R. I., favoring passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1466. By Mr. COOK: Petition of Machinists' Local, No. 450, and Sheet Metal Workers' Local, No. 480, of Logansport, Ind., in favor of the Brookhart-Hull bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1467. Also, petition of Charter Oak Council, of Hartford City, Ind., in favor of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1468. By Mr. CRAMTON: Resolution of the Polar Bear Association, Detroit, Mich., urging favorable action on an adjusted compensation act for former service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1469. By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of postal employees at New Castle, Ind., in re reclassification act and salary increase to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1470. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Legion posts of Sangamon County, Ill., praying for the passage of an

adjusted compensation bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1471. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of East St. Louis, Ill., opposing any amendment of the transportation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1472. Also, petition of sundry citizens of La Salle County, Ill., favoring repeal of excise taxes on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1473. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the executive committee of the Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Association, of Enid, Okla., dated February 21, 1924, recommending the retention of the tax-exempt security law, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1474. By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring House bills 5843 and 5429; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1475. By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of Octave O. Desmarais, manager of the Coca Cola Bottling Works, Fall River, Mass., urging the repeal of tax on carbonated beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1476. By Mr. KING: Petition of the Charles De Crane Post of the American Legion, of Atkinson, Ill., favoring the adjusted compensation bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1477. By Mr. McNULTY: Petition of the Men's Club of the First Baptist Church of Bayonne, N. J., in favor of Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1478. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Carlsbad, N. Mex., F. E. Hubert, chairman of the transportation committee, opposing any change or amendment to the transportation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1479. Also, petition of the Lordsburg Woman's Club, Lordsburg, N. Mex., in support of Senate bill 3855, the Lenroot substitute bill; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1480. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Amos Lodge, No. 27, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, condemning the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1481. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of auxiliary of the Edwin Scott Linton American Legion Post, Washington, Pa., favoring the adjusted compensation bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, March 3, 1924.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for these days of brightness and of cheer, the harbingers of the good time near at hand, when winter shall be past and the sound of the singing of birds shall be heard in the land. We do ask Thee to give unto us strength of purpose and such ideals of devotion to duty that we may realize that we can make the world a happier and a better place in which to live; that we can add to its cheer and deliver many from its sorrow and gloom. The Lord our God help us continually. We humbly ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, February 29, 1924, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Curtis	Hale	McKellar
Ashurst	Dale	Harrell	McLean
Ball	Dial	Harris	McNary
Bayard	Dill	Harrison	Mayfield
Borah	Edge	Heflin	Moses
Brandegee	Edwards	Howell	Norris
Brookhart	Elkins	Johnson, Minn.	Oddie
Broussard	Ernst	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman
Bruce	Ferris	Jones, Wash.	Pepper
Bursum	Fess	Kendrick	Phipps
Cameron	Fletcher	Keyes	Pittman
Capper	Frazier	King	Ralston
Caraway	George	Ladd	Ransdell
Copeland	Gerry	La Follette	Reed, Pa.
Couzens	Glass	Lenroot	Robinson
Cummins	Gooding	Lodge	Sheppard